DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 069 PS 014 626

AUTHOR	Empson, Judith V.; And Others
TITLE	An Impact Evaluation of the Resource Access Projects, 1982-1983.
INSTITUTION	Littlejohn (Roy) Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 83
CONTRACT	HHS-105-C-82-008
NOTE	245p.; For earlier versions of this document, see ED 189 799 and PS 014 643.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *Budgets; Conferences; *Day Care; Delivery Systems; Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Information Storage; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Participation; Profiles; *Program Evaluation; *Services
IDENTIFIERS	Project Head Start; *Resource Access Projects; Task Force Approach

ABSTRACT

Each year, Head Start makes at least 10 percent of its enrollment opportunities available to children with handicapping conditions. Currently, 15 Resource Access Projects (RAPs) form a national network offering a training and technical assistance program identifying resources, providing resource materials to Head Start grantees, facilitating collaboration between Head Start and other agencies, and providing training and technical assistance on mainstreaming. From the beginning, an evaluation component has been built into the training and technical assistance plan. The seventh evaluation of RAP impact on Head Start services to handicapped children, this report presents findings for the 1982-83 program year. Evaluation data were collected through annual on-site interviews with RAP staff, telephone interviews with a random sample of 400 Head Start grantees and all 55 state (or equivalent) educational agencies (SEAs), and a survey of approximately 2,700 participants at RAP training conferences. The overall finding was that satisfaction with RAP increased or remained the same, as reported by Head Starts, SEAs, and trainees. After an introductory chapter, major chapters report more specific findings on RAP budgets, services to grantees, RAP training conferences, facilitation of collaborative agreements, and participation in RAP task forces. Briefer chapters discuss the establishment and updating of a file on resource providers; the management information system; needs assessment; national RAP, Head Start Association, and advisory committee meetings; and the annual survey of handicap services. The concluding chapter offers a summary of findings and recommendations. RAP profiles and state education agencies' impressions of the individual projects in the RAP network are appended. (RH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED250069

An Impact Evaluation of The Resource Access Projects 1982-1983

HHS-105-C-82-008

Prepared By:
Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc.
1331 H Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20005

December, 1983

PS 014626

Authors

Judith V. Empson
Project Director

Janice L. Idyll
Co-Director

Lee Clark Gruber
Assistant Project Driector

Marcia McGrath
Field Analyst

Richard Ellis
Data Analyst

Lucy Lyons

Administration For Children, Youth and Families

Dr. Bernard Brown
RAP Evaluation Project Officer

Ms. Rossie Kelly
Acting RAP Program Officer

Ms. LaSandra Boone-Brown
RAP Evaluation Contracting Officer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The RAP evaluation staff acknowledge the contributions of many individuals to the evaluation effort throughout the year and to the preparation of this report.

We thank Dr. Bernard Brown, the RAP evaluation project officer, for his assistance throughout the project, and Ms. Rossie Kelly, the acting project officer for the RAP network, for her efforts on behalf of the evaluation. We also thank Ms. Barbara Bates for her careful review of this document.

The impact report has relied on information from hundreds of individuals at Head Start programs and State Education Agencies. Their perceptions of RAPs' services have enabled our staff to corroborate findings, document successes and identify areas for improvement.

For the seventh year RAP project staff have contributed generously of their time and perspective to the evaluation effort, particularly during our on-site interviews and file research.

Finally, the project staff thanks Louise DuRant for her conscientious and successful application of computer skills through the data entry and production of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The RAP	1
	RAP Tasks	4
	Characteristics of RAP Service Areas	4
	The Evaluation Process	7
	Methodology	7
	Instrumentation and Procedures	8
2.	RAP BUDGETS	10
	Annual RAP Program Budget Changes	10
	The "Typical" RAP	12
	Analysis of RAP Budget Line Items	16
	Salaries and Staff	16
	Indirect Costs	16
	Travel	17
	Computer Costs	17
	Other Direct Costs	18
3.	SERVICES TO GRANTEES	19
	A Summary of RAP Activities and Task Records	19
	Detailed Analysis of Activities	20
	Volume	22
	Requestor	22
	Types of Activities	24
	Provider Type	26
	Content	27
	An Analysis of Task Records	29
	Volume	30
	Types of Task Records	33
	Training and Technical Assistance	33
	Special Projects	36
	The Head Start Telephone Survey: Assessments of Services to Grantees	37
	Head Start Clientele Satisfaction with RAP Services	38
	Initiation of Contacts	38
	Description of Services Received by Grantees	41
	Proportion of Teachers Trained in Mainstreaming Conferences	42
	Head Starts' Perceptions of The Most Valuable Services Received from RAPs	45
	Problems	45
	RAP Perceptions of Grantee Requests	47
	Barriers to Providing Quality Services	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS Cont'd

		Page
4.	RAP TRAINING CONFERENCES	48
	Overall Scale of RAP Mainstreaming Training	48
	New Practices and Strategies	52
	Evaluating The Training Conferences	54
	Trend in Conference Size	56
	Background of Trainees	56
	Overall Satisfaction	58
	Conference Topics	62
	Changes Resulting From The Training	68
	Verifying The Expected Changes in Practices: The Long-Term Follow-Up	70
	What Trainees Liked Best	72
	"Unexpected Condition" and Other Problems	73
	Suggestions for Next Year	75
	Summary	75
5.	FACILITATING COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS	79
	SEA/Head Start Collaboration	79
	Other Collaborative Efforts with SEAs	88
	Relationships Among Satisfaction and Other Factors	91
	Head Start/LEA Agreements	95
	Collaboration With Other Agencies	102
6.	PARTICIPATE IN RAP TASK FORCES	105
	Computer Task Force	105
	PA26 Task Force	106
	Task Force On Innovative Approaches To Increasing The Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children In Head Start	106
	Child Abuse and Neglect Task Force	107
	Language Development Task Force	107
	Problems	108
7.	ESTABLISH AND UPDATE A FILE OF RESOURCE PROVIDERS	109
8.	MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM	110
	Is The System Working?	111
	Activities	112
	Attributes	112
	Task Records	112

TABLE OF CONTENTS Cont'd

		Page
9.	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	114
10.	NATIONAL RAP MEETINGS	116
11.	HEAD START ASSOCIATION MEETINGS	118
12.	ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS	119
13.	ANNUAL SURVEY OF HANDICAP SERVICES	121
14.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDTIONS	122
	Findings	122
	Recommendations	126
	APPENDIXES	129
	Appendix A: The RAP Profiles	129
	Appendix B: SEA Impressions of the RAP Network: Individual RAP Summaries	191

TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	RAP Sponsors and Locations	2
Table 1.2	Characteristics of Individual RAP Service Areas	5
Table 2.1	Total Program Budgets, FY'77-'83	11
Table 2.2	RAP Project Budgets, 1982-1983	13
Table 2.3	Comparison of Average Total RAP Budgets and Selected Line Items, FY'77-FY'83	15
Table 3.1	Characteristics of RAP Activities, 1982-1983	21
Table 3.2	Colntent Attributes, 1982-83	28
Table 3.3	Classification of Task Records, 1982-1983	31
Table 3.4	Recipients of RAP Training Sessions (Other than Mainstreaming)	34
Table 3.5	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects: 1982-1983 (Number of cases, representation of main contacts, satisfaction, initiation)	39
Table 3.6	Comparison of Individual Satisfaction Scores, 1980-83	40
Table 3.7	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects, 1982-83 (Types of contacts with the RAPs)	43
Table 3.8	Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects: 1982-1983 (Percent of teaching staff trained by RAPs, valued RAP services, problems)	44
Table 3.9	Comparison of Head Start Responses, 1980-1983	46
Table 4.1	Staff Trained by RAPs at Mainstreaming Conferences, 1979-83	49
Table 4.2	Participation in RAP Mainstreaming Training Conferences, 1982-83	50
Table 4.3	Number of State Training Conferences and Training Participants, By RAP	55
Table 4.4	Background of RAP Training Participants: Types of Trainees, By RAP	57
Table 4.5	Additional Background of Trainees: Work with Handicapped Children; Previous RAP Training	59
Table 4.6	Satisfaction with Mainstreaming Training, By RAP	61
Table 4.7	Workshop Topics Cited by Training Conference Participants, By RAP	64
Table 4.8	Topics Cited, Continued: Workshops Cited on Specific Handicaps, By RAP	66
Table 4.9	What Trainees Expect to do Differently After Their Training, By RAP	69
Table 4.10	Comparison of Long-Term and Short-Term Samples	71
Table 4.11	Unexpected Conditions That Affected The Training Conferences, By RAP	74
Table 4.12	Other Problems That Affected The Training Conferences, By RAP	76
Table 4.13	Suggestions from Conference Participants for Next Year's RAP Training	77
Table 5.1	Existing SEA/Head Start Agreements as Reported By RAPs, 1983	80
Table 5.2	Abbreviated Contents of SEA/Head Start Collaborative Agreements.	82
Table 5.3	Key Points of New SEA/Head Start Agreements in 1982-83	83
Table 5.4	Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction Program by Program 1982-1983	92
Table 5.5	National Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction	93
Table 5.6	Correlations of SEA Satisfaction	94
Table 5.7	LEA/Head Start Agreements Directly Facilitated By RAP, 1983	97

INTRODUCTION

Each year Head Start makes at least 10 percent of its enrollment opportunities available to children with handicapping conditions. This commitment, mandated by legislation, carries with it a responsibility to locate and enroll handicapped children, provide a range of specialized services, and prepare Head Start staff to mainstream children with special needs.

In order to prepare teachers and administrators in the Head Start program for this work, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) designed a training and technical assistance program which would identify local, regional, and national resources, provide resource materials to grantees, facilitate collaboration between Head Start and other agencies, and provide training and technical assistance on mainstreaming. Thirteen Resource Access Projects (RAPs) were selected in 1976. Today, fifteen projects form the national RAP network.

Built into the training and technical assistance plan from the beginning was an evaluation component. ACYF wanted to facilitate judgments about the program's worth and to give the RAPs a mechanism by which they could assess their own effectiveness. A third-party evaluation contract was therefore awarded along with the selection of the RAPs themselves in 1976; since that time the network has been evaluated annually. This is the seventh evaluation of the impact of the RAP program on Head Start's handicap effort.

The RAP

Most of the original 13 RAP grantees had previously operated Handicapped Children's Early Education Programs (HCEEPs) funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (now the Office of Special Education of the Department of Education) and had sound reputations in the field of early childhood special education. Several of the RAP directors had direct experience in Head Start. Many RAP staff members have also been Head Start directors, special education teachers, or speech pathologists.

Each ACYF region is served by at least one RAP; some regions are served by two or three. Nine of the 15 RAPs are based at universities; three are sponsored by public school districts, and three are private research or nonprofit service agencies. The locations of projects, the states they serve, and their sponsors are listed in Table 1.1.

On the average, each RAP is staffed by three and a half full-time equivalent (FTE) persons. All programs have a director, generally with responsibilities in addition to RAP; often directors' time is donated. Each RAP has at least one full-time coordinator; some have two associates

Table 1.1

RAP Sponsors and Locations

HHS Region	States	RAP Sponsor & Location
I	MA VT CT NH ME RI	Education Development Center Newton, Massachusetts
II	NY NJ PR VI	New York University New York City, New York
III	DE MD PA VA DC WV	Georgetown University Washington, D.C.
IV	FL GA NC SC	Chapel Hill Outreach Project Carrboro School District Chapel Hill, North Carolina
	AL KY TN	The Urban Observatory Peabody College of Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee
	MS	Friends of Children (subcontracted through the Chapel Hill Outreach Program) Jackson, Mississippi
V	IL IN OH	University of Illinois Champaign, Illinois
	MI MN WI	Portage Project CESA-12 Portage, Wisconsin
VI	AR LA NM OK TX	Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas

Table 1.1 contd

HHS Region	States	RAP Sponsor & Location
VII	IA KS MO NB	University of Kansas Kansas City, Kansas
VIII	CO MT ND SD UT WY	University of Denver Denver, Colorado
IX	AZ CA NV	Child, Youth and Family Services Los Angeles, California
	HA CNMI Amer Samoa Guam Mar. Is Ponape Truk Yap Palau	University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii
X	ID OR WA	Portland State University Portland, Oregon
	AK	Easter Seal Society Anchorage, Alaska

or co-coordinators. All RAPs have the services of a full or part-time secretary, and several have one to two additional resource or training specialists.

RAP Tasks

The scope of work in each RAP contract obligates them to the following eleven tasks. They are presented below as RAPs prioritized them in 1982-83.

- Provide services to Head Start grantees
- Conduct state training conferences
- Assess the needs of Head Start grantees
- Facilitate collaborative agreements
- Implement a management information system
- Attend national RAP meetings
- Attend Head Start Association meetings
- Participate in RAP task forces
- Establish/update a file of resource providers
- Conduct advisory committee meetings
- Assist Head Start grantees with the Annual Survey of Handicap Services

Each of these tasks is reviewed in detail in sections of this report.

Characteristics of RAP Service Areas

An understanding of the contexts in which RAPs work may help the reader to interpret data and to understand the service delivery patterns which are described in the body of this report. All RAPs have the challenge to design services for Head Start grantees that vary widely in size, setting (rural/urban), type of sponsoring organization, and expertise. Table 1.2, Characteristics of Individual RAP Service Areas , describes some of the variations to which each RAP must respond: the number of Head Start programs served, the number of teaching staff and handicapped children within the programs, the square miles within the RAP's catchment area, the numbers of full-time equivalent staff, the ratio of RAP staff per Head Start program, the ratio of RAP staff per Head Start teaching staff (teachers and teacher aides), and the ratio of RAP staff per handicapped child.

The three right-hand columns of the table show some differences in the relative burden on RAP projects. On the average, each RAP staff member serves 21 grantees, 651 teaching staff, and 892 handicapped children. Mississippi, Hawaii, and Alaska have a clear advantage over the others with respect to the number of grantees to serve. PSU, Region VII, Portage, and Los Angeles also have lower than average staff-to-grantee ratios. Texas Tech and Region III are the most severely taxed; respectively, each staff member serves 47 or 45 grantees, more than double the average burden. Chapel Hill also carries a heavier burden than others, with each staff member serving 33 grantees.

Table 1.2

Characteristics of Individual RAP Service Areas

RAP	# Head Start Grantees[a]	# HS Teaching Staff[c]	# Handicapped Children[b]	Square Miles	FTE	FTE Per HS	FTE Per Teaching Staff	FTE Per HC Child
New England	74	1,500	2,181	67,000	3.5	21	429	623
NYU	81	4,006	4,422	61,000	3.3	25	1,214	1,340
Region III	118	3,142	4,879	123,000	2.6	45	1,208	1,877
Chapel Hill	112	3,483	4,373	191,000	3.4	33	1,024	1,286
Nashville	84	2,723	3,518	132,000	3.9	22	698	902
Mississippi	24	2,750	2,923	48,000	3.8	6	724	769
Univ. of Ill.	114	3,400	6,078	132,000	5.3	22	642	1,147
Portage	85	2,170	3,428	190,000	4.5	19	482	762
Texas Tech	140	3,621	5,496	561,000	3.0	47	1,207	1,832
Region VII	67	1,053	2,455	285,000	4.0	17	263	614
Univ. of Denver	54	885	1,326	574,000	2.6	21	340	510
Los Angeles	57	3,829	3,917	383,000	3.5	16	1,094	1,119
Pacific	13	436	408	7,300	4.6	3	95	87
PSU	49	773	1,349	249,000	2.5	20	309	540
Alaska	3	82	84	586,000	2.6	1	32	32
Average	72	2,257	3,122	239,000	3.5	21	651	892

[a]Exclusive of IMPD Head Start programs, inclusive of Summer Head Starts and Parent Child Centers.

[b]Figures taken from National Tables 1981-82, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (excludes IMPD programs).

[c]Figures taken from interviews with RAPs, 1983

Because RAPs have direct contact with teaching staff at training conferences and occasionally respond to teacher requests, the ratio of RAP staff to Head Start teaching staff is another important indicator of variations in work loads from one RAP to the next. At the NYU, Region III, and Texas Tech RAPs, each staff member is associated with more than 1,200 teachers, twice the national average; Los Angeles and Chapel Hill also carry a much higher ratio than other RAPs. Significantly lower ratios are again found at the Pacific and Alaska RAPs.

When the third measure of relative burden(s) is inspected, the ratio of RAP staff per handicapped child, Table 1.2 indicates that Region III and Texas Tech have the heaviest loads, more than double the average ratio of 892 children per RAP staff member. NYU, Chapel Hill, University of Illinois, and Los Angeles also serve large numbers of handicapped children with relatively small staffs. Conversely, the Pacific and Alaska RAPs have the smallest ratios of staff to handicapped children. University of Denver, Portland State University, Region VII, and New England also have lighter loads.

Geographic and cultural factors greatly affect budgets, and training logistics for some RAPs. For example, severe weather in Alaska makes some sites difficult to reach for long periods of time. Infrequent transportation in the Pacific makes travel to and from isolated areas difficult. The Alaska and Pacific RAPs must also adapt to accommodate bilingual, multicultural trainees.

Almost every RAP must deal with as many regionally-funded T/TA systems as there are states in their service areas. Each of these systems functions autonomously. RAP projects must understand and coordinate with other T/TA systems to allow Head Starts to make optimal use of all resources available to them. In Regions IV, V, and VI, portions of the regional contractors' mandates are very similar to RAP's (e.g., responsibility for facilitating collaboration). This requires coordination in order to minimize duplication of efforts.

Unique to Regions IV and VI are regionally funded handicap service systems. In Region IV, Specially Funded Cluster Coordinators (SFCs), each of whom works with five to seven grantees, are an able and direct link to Head Start grantees for RAPs. RAPs view them as extensions of their own resources and work closely with the SFCs to provide training, disseminate materials and information, and offer mutual support. In Region VI, 32 handicap consortia are regionally funded to maximize the use of resources, and the Texas Tech RAP, like those in Region IV, works with the consortia coordinators for access to the grantees.

The Evaluation Process

Each year the evaluation staff at Roy Littlejohn Associates reports on the performance of the 15 RAPs on each of the eleven tasks in their scope of work. Evaluation data are collected through annual on-site interviews with RAP staff, telephone interviews with a random sample of 400 Head Start grantees and all 55 State (or equivalent) Education Agencies (SEA's), and a survey of approximately 2,700 participants at RAP training conferences. ACYF uses information about projects' strengths, weaknesses, and service situations to remediate individual projects, launch new program initiatives, and make other policy decisions.

So that program changes can be based on the perceptions of users of the program, RLA has developed an illuminative, or formative, evaluation design. The following assumptions are implicit in RLA's evaluation philosophy:

- The evaluation effort was conceived by ACYF as an integral part of the RAP program development; it provides support, accountability, and objectivity.
- The analytical framework developed by RLA progresses from RAP-centered perceptions of performance to client/user-centered perceptions of RAP's impact, so that the programs are viewed in a progressively broader context.
- The evaluation is formative by design. It identifies program trends, successful approaches to problem-solving, barriers to program implementation, and unique factors affecting project operations. Ranking, quantification, and summation are minimized.
- Evaluators do not weight or judge program priorities. The ACYF program officer determines program priorities and communicates them to the RAP contractors. The evaluator develops tools that help ACYF articulate priorities, communicate priorities to RAP projects, and analyze the effectiveness of implementing each part of the program.
- The evaluation is a vehicle for communication among RAPs and a source of assistance for both new and established RAP contractors.

Methodology

RLA used a team of seven analysts with Head Start and program assessment experience to evaluate the RAP program. Four members of the team participated in every aspect of the work, which includes field visits, clientele inquiries, tabulation and analysis of data, and report writing. A fifth was engaged this year to assist with the computerized tabulation and analysis of data, a sixth to assist with field work, and a seventh to assist with writing and editing of the final report.

The principal methods of data collection were personal interviews with RAP staff, comprehensive reviews of files at each project site, and telephone surveys with Head Start and SEA staff. Additionally, confidential evaluation forms prepared by the evaluator were collected from participants at selected RAP training conferences. RLA conducted follow-up phone interviews with a limited number of these conference participants to help verify the long-term effects of the training.

Instrumentation and Procedures

Two evaluation tools--the on-site RAP interview guide and a matrix of RAP service transactions--were developed and used by RLA staff to assist in collecting information during field visits to RAPs in the Spring of 1983. Each of these site visits lasted two days and was conducted by a team of two evaluators, one of whom had visited the site before. Site visits were scheduled by phone and confirmed by letter.

The interview guide was the master tool used on-site. It structured evaluators' inquiries with RAP staff regarding the major areas of program operation: goals, internal project characteristics, budget, task priorities, performance on each of the 11 required tasks, relationships with regional and national ACYF offices, regional contexts, perceptions of project accomplishments, barriers to service, and each RAP's recommendations for the network. During the interviews an emphasis was placed on reviewing RAP's services to Head Start grantees, mainstreaming conferences, and collaboration efforts, since evaluators had learned from previous findings that both the RAPs and ACYF perceive these tasks as being the most important. To help RAPs prepare for the evaluation site visits, a copy of the interview guide was mailed to them in advance.

The transaction matrix was used during the second day of each site visit to analyze the RAP's completed activities between July 1, 1982 and March 15, 1983. The matrix recorded the type of activity, requestor, provider, geographic location, and content of each RAP service contact. Evaluators also collected information about each RAP's work from ongoing task records which were initiated during this same time frame.

Two separate series of telephone interviews were conducted to assess the impact of RAP work on clients. Interviews with State Education Agencies in June 1983 focused on the task requiring RAPs to facilitate collaboration between Head Start and public schools. Prior to these interviews, a letter was sent to each of these SEAs asking for its cooperation. An identical protocol was followed for Head Start telephone inquiries, conducted from March through May 1983. A stratified random sample of Head Starts was used in this survey, drawn from lists submitted by all 15 RAPs. The Head Start survey is used each year to determine what services Head Starts are receiving from RAP, and whether they are satisfied with these services.

Precoded interview guides were developed for each of these surveys. Evaluators collected data on the clients' familiarity with RAP, the initiator of contact, frequency and type of contacts, satisfaction with services, most valued services, and any problems with RAP experienced by the Head Start or SEA representative.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the state-level mainstreaming training, RLA asked the RAPs to distribute a participant's evaluation questionnaire to trainees at a quarter of their training conferences. This form solicited information on respondents' positions in Head Start, conference topics, trainee satisfaction, what was especially liked in the training, descriptions of what trainees might do differently as a result of the training, problems, and suggestions for future training. Completed forms were sealed and returned either by the RAPs or by the participants, and were processed by RLA. Subsequently, a small follow-up sample was drawn from the group of responding trainees who had volunteered call-back information. Persons were selected whose positions and satisfaction level were representative of the short-term evaluation population. At least three months after they had participated in their training, telephone interviews were conducted with these longer-term participants to see if expected training impacts had actually occurred. The instrument used in these interviews asked participants what they were doing differently as a result of the RAP training, whether the training was designed to meet their needs, and whether any changes would make it more useful.

This Impact Evaluation Report presents findings for the July 1982 to July 1983 program year even though several RAPs have funding cycles which do not coincide with this time frame. Comparisons are made with earlier findings, but the report concentrates on RAP's seventh year of program activity.

RAP BUDGETS

This chapter begins with a brief budgetary history of the RAP program and the major programmatic initiatives linked to budget changes. The budget is then viewed from the perspective of the "average" or "typical" RAP project and examined for what it buys given the variations which exist among the catchment areas of the network. Finally, there is an analysis of selected budget line items.

The RAP program budget totaled $2,317,395 for the 1982-83 program year. The RAP budgets are depicted in Table 2.1 RAP Program Budget, FY'77-83. Increases over the years have sustained the original projects and added new contractors serving Mississippi, Alaska, and Hawaii and the Pacific. New initiatives have included the introduction and expansion of an automated record keeping system, collaboration with public agencies serving handicapped children, and a greatly expanded training effort at which each year between 11,000 and 15,000 participants, mostly Head Start teaching staff, receive a thorough orientation to the concepts of mainstreaming young handicapped children.

Annual RAP Program Budget Changes

The RAP program began in FY'77. The first budget supported 12 regional projects and staff were usually part-time. A thirteenth RAP was funded to serve Indian and Migrant Head Start programs throughout the country.

In FY'78, the Mississippi and Alaska RAPs were added to the network, while the RAP which served IMPD Head Start programs was terminated. The FY'78 budget enlarged travel allotments, which had been substantially underfunded in the first year. Also, a new program initiative, promoting formal collaborative agreements between State Education Agencies and Head Start programs, was introduced into the scope of work.

The program budget in FY'79 rose by 38.6 percent over FY'78. The network was expanded to its present size to include a RAP located in Hawaii to serve Head Start grantees in the Pacific; Texas Tech was introduced to the network replacing the previous contractor for Region VI. Two new initiatives were introduced: a massive training effort to orient Head Start teachers to the concepts of mainstreaming children with handicaps, and a pilot computerized management and information system for the entire network. The FY'79 budget supported more full-time project staff permitting the RAP projects to reduce their need for staff support from other grants at the sponsoring agencies.

For FY'80, the budget increased by 9.7 percent. The computerized management and information system was expanded to all continental RAPs,

Table 2.1

Total Program Budgets
FY'77-'83

Line Items	FY'77	FY'78	FY'79	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	FY'83
Salaries	$ 460,257	$ 557,592	$ 729,461	$ 741,386	$ 845,854	$ 947,743	$ 1,050,589
Travel	74,386	120,656	172,204	185,236	247,689	257,780	251,763
Computer	N/A	N/A	44,322	119,529	138,100	160,332	160,204
Other Costs	198,254	127,748	237,359	229,117	234,188	256,415	274,340
Overhead & Fringe	144,994	245,711	274,386	323,852	464,536	518,850	580,499
Total Budget	$ 877,891	$1,051,707	$1,457,732	$1,599,120	$1,930,367	$2,141,126	$2,317,395

salary levels were increased, and travel costs rose commensurate with inflation, although some other costs decreased. The Region III RAP at Georgetown University replaced the previous contractor for Region III.

The FY'81 program budget rose 20.7 percent over the previous year. The major program initiative was the revitalization of the network's management information system. Two contractors, Portland State University and the University of Denver, each with higher fringe and overhead rates, replaced two RAPs funded in previous years. All but one of the RAP contracts were signed with options for FY'82 and '83.

The government picked up its option for FY'82 at costs which had been submitted and negotiated previously. The total program budget rose by 10.9 percent over the previous year and the tasks and programmatic initiatives were unchanged.

Like last year, FY'83 costs have been contained by means of the contract options. New monies amounted to $176,269 across the network, or an 8.2 percent increase over the previous year. Fifty-eight percent of new money went for salaries. The average salary of $18,873 for the previous year rose 4.8 percent to $19,785, while the average complement of staff per project only rose by the equivalent of .1 (FTE) person. Indirect costs (overhead and fringe) accounted for most of the remainder of the new monies; $61,649 went toward overhead and fringe costs, an average of $4,110 per RAP. (Note that indirect costs are calculated on direct salary costs, and necessarily increase accordingly.) Computer costs remained the same. Travel decreased. "Other" costs rose modestly, an average of $1,195 per RAP.

The "Typical" RAP

The variations among individual RAP budgets can be seen in a review of Table 2.2, RAP Project Budgets, 1982-1983 . They range from a low of $126,531 at the Mississippi RAP to a high of $219,137 at the Pacific RAP. Substantial differences exist within the budget line items because RAPs differ in their needs for staff, travel, telephone and other expenses due to variations in geography, density, and needs in their service areas. Only the category for computer costs is relatively uniform at every RAP. The Introduction to this report identifies some of the regional factors which place varying demands on RAP budgets. To summarize briefly, RAPs have wide-ranging numbers of Head Start grantees to serve and consequently large variations in the size of the population of handicapped children. Moreover, the geographic size of the regions served by RAPs adds relative burden or ease on the travel budgets. Furthermore, some RAPs serve diverse cultural populations or must adapt to particular state or regional service systems.

To facilitate comparison of these budgets, we have constructed a hypothetical "typical" budget and service area from a composite of means. The "Average RAP" serves 72 Head Start programs that enroll 3,122

Table 2.2

RAP Project Budgets, 1982-1983

Region	RAP	Total Budget	Selected Budget Line Items					OH & Fr as % of Sal.	Staff	
			Salaries	Travel	Other Costs	Computer	Overhead & Fringe		FTE	Sal/FTE
I	New England	$142,502	$65,874	$11,871	$16,529	$10,680	$37,548	57.0	3.5	$18,821
II	NYU	181,658	73,751	11,770	16,500	11,500	68,137	92.4	3.3	22,349
III	Region III	149,601	73,423	17,391	8,500	10,680	39,607	53.9	2.6	28,240
IV	Chapel Hill	149,128	67,854	21,200	16,073	10,800	33,201	48.9	3.4	19,957
	Nashville	133,103	60,360	16,118	12,950	10,880	32,795	54.3	3.9	15,447
	Mississippi	126,531	66,366	10,440	12,926	10,800	25,999	39.2	3.8	17,465
V	U of Ill.	134,149	74,966	14,610	14,781	10,800	18,992	25.3	5.3	14,145
	Portage	154,448	84,752	20,613	21,800	8,584	18,694	18.4	4.5	18,834
VI	Texas Tech	140,768	66,295	15,450	18,852	10,800	29,371	44.3	3.0	22,098
VII	Region VII	141,811	76,814	15,345	14,150	10,680	24,822	32.3	4.0	19,204
VIII	U of Denver	164,918	59,404	19,500	7,000	10,800	68,214	114.8	2.6	22,848
IX	Los Angeles	181,597	77,276	10,000	40,310	10,800	43,211	55.9	3.5	22,079
	Pacific	219,137	89,033	37,723	23,072	10,800	58,509	65.7	4.6	19,355
X	PSU	144,364	43,264	16,227	27,877	10,800	46,196	106.8	2.5	17,306
	Alaska	153,680	71,157	13,500	23,020	10,800	35,203	49.5	2.6	27,368
TOTAL		2,317,395	1,050,589	251,763	274,340	160,204	580,499	55.3	53.1	
AVERAGE		154,493	70,039	16,785	18,289	10,680	38,700		3.5	19,785

handicapped children in a catchment area of four states. This hypothetical RAP has a budget of $154,493, distributed as follows:

Direct Salaries		$ 70,039
Fringe Benefits, at 18.9% of Direct Salaries		13,258
Overhead at 36.3% of Direct Salaries		25,442
Travel		16,785
Computer		10,680
Other Costs		
Materials/Equipment/Supplies/ Conference Costs	5,059	
Reproduction/Printing	1,576	
Space Rental	1,292	
Communications	4,086	
Consultants, Contracted Services	6,276	
		$ 18,289
		154,493

The salary line for this average RAP would support 3.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) personnel; one of these would be a full-time coordinator and one would be a full-time secretary or administrative assistant. A part-time person is apt to direct the project and the remaining staff would be resource or training specialists. All professional staff would be likely to have formal schooling in special education and experience either as a trainer, or with Head Start, or both. The average FTE salary for the staff is $19,785, as noted above.

Overhead calculations follow a variety of formulae in cost proposals. For comparative purposes, we define overhead as a percentage of total direct salaries, reflecting widespread contract practices and federal agency conventions. Fringe benefits are treated as a part of this overhead. For our "Average RAP," the multiplier is 55 percent, which is low by most standards although it is about the norm for the better contractors in human services programs.

Travel costs for the typical RAP would include in-region travel for staff, advisory committee members, and consultants, and costs for attending national RAP meetings. Communication costs incorporate both telephone and postage. Materials, equipment, and supplies include purchase of resource library materials, rental of office machinery, office supplies, computer repair, and expenses related to conducting conferences. Reproduction and printing apply to distributed media, i.e., brochures, films, slide presentations, pamphlets, or other duplicated documents. Consultants and contract services usually purchase expertise for workshop presentations, but also include bookkeeping services, custodial care, and graphics. Table 2.3 compares costs at the "typical" RAP from FY'77 to FY'83.

Table 2.3
Comparison of Average Total RAP Budgets and Selected Line Items
FY'77 - FY'83

Budget Items	FY'77	FY'78	FY'79	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	FY'83
Total Budget	$ 67,530	$ 75,122	$ 97,169	$ 106,608	$ 128,691	$ 142,741	$ 154,493
Salaries	35,404	39,828	48,640	49,426	56,390	63,183	70,039
Travel	5,722	8,618	11,480	12,349	16,513	17,186	16,785
Other Costs	15,250[a]	9,152	15,824	15,274	15,612	17,094	18,289
Computer Costs	-	-	2,955	7,969	9,207	10,689	10,680
Overhead/Fringe	11,153	17,551	18,279	21,591	30,969	34,589	38,700
Overhead/Fringe as a Percentage of Salaries	32[a]	44	28	44	58	54.7	55.3
FTE[b]	2.9	2.97	3.48	3.15	3.31	3.42	3.50
Salaries/pd. FTE	11,881	13,640	14,634	15,691	17,665	18,873	19,785

[a] Fringe treated as other costs for 1976-77

[b] Donated personnel deducted from FTE totals

Analysis of RAP Budget Line Items

Total Budgets :

- All budgets were increased this year.
- Most RAPs saw overall appreciations of between four and nine percent. Mississippi increased the least--only 0.6 percent. Four RAPs had increases of ten percent or more: Nashville (13%); Los Angeles (12.4%); NYU (10.8%); and PSU (10.6%).
- Overall allocation of funds into budget categories are proportionate to those of the previous year: salary--45 percent of budget; overhead and fringe--25 percent of budget; other costs--12 percent of budget; travel--11 percent of budget; and computer--7 percent of budget.

Salaries and Staff :

- The program budget for salaries totaled $1,050,589. Increase in salary line generally supported salary raises rather than additional staff.
- All RAPs had a gain in this line item--usually between seven and nine percent. University of Denver had the lowest increase for salaries (5.4%). Six RAPs had relatively large increases in the salary line: Alaska (18.8%); Nashville (18.6%); PSU (17.8%); Portage (15.8%); University of Illinois (15.2%); NYU (13.5%).
- The average salary of $19,785 (including both professional and support personnel) was an increase of 4.8 percent over last year. Salaries were lowest at Illinois and Nashville, and highest at Region III and Alaska.
- The network achieved a small increase in total FTE staff effort, from 51.3 to 53.1 overall. Staffing levels remained fixed at seven RAPs. Region III lost one staff position, while the Pacific RAP gained one. All others gained or lost 0.5 FTE staff or less. Only Portland, Alaska, Denver, and Region III had FTE staffs of fewer than three persons; the former two contractors drew heavily on the supplementary services of consultants.

Indirect Costs

- Indirect costs, i.e., charges for fringe and overhead, totaled $580,499, an increase of 11.8 percent over last year.
- Indirect costs constitute one-quarter of the total program budget.

- Allocations for indirect costs averaged $38,700 per project, and ranged from a low of $18,694 at Portage to highs of over $68,000 at the University of Denver and NYU.

- The computation for indirect costs this year averaged 55 percent of salaries. Rates range from 18 to 115 percent of salaries. These variations are due at least in part to variations in RAP project locations. Portage is located in a small town in rural Wisconsin and is sponsored by a local educational services agency. Other RAPs are in major urban areas and sponsors are more typically higher-overhead organizations like the universities. Such variations have pronounced effects on expenses such as rent.

- Fringe benefits have not been a major source of variation in indirect costs; rates are fairly stable across projects, usually between 17 and 25 percent of salaries.

- Variations in overhead rates were extreme, ranging from $2,500 at Portage to $56,037 at the University of Denver. NYU and Portland State also have high allocations for overhead.

Travel

- For the first time since the origin of the network, there was a decrease in travel funds.

- The travel allocation was $251,763, about 11 percent of the total program budget. Seven RAPs had almost identical travel budgets; five RAPs actually had lower travel budgets than in the previous year. Only the Region III, Texas Tech, and Pacific RAPs had budget increases for travel.

- There is a rough correlation between travel expenses and the geographic size of regions. RAPs with smaller areas to serve (e.g., New England) had lower allocations for travel. Those with larger areas, like Denver and Hawaii, had commensurate budgets.

Computer Costs

- Funding for computer costs was almost identical to the previous year. Seven percent of the total program budget, or $160,204, supported the computerized network. Each RAP received about $10,680 for specified hardware and software.

Other Direct Costs

- Other direct costs include all remaining out-of-pocket charges for communications (telephone and postage), equipment, supplies, printing and reproduction, materials, consultants, contracted services (design work, custodial services, bookkeeping, etc.), space rental, and charges related to conferences. Costs for these items varied at each RAP.

- RAPs differ widely in their budgeting practices for other costs, which range from $7,000 at the University of Denver and $8,500 at Region III, to $40,310 at Los Angeles. All RAPs allow for telephone costs, but the estimates range from $11,420 at Los Angeles to $1,200 at Portage. Four RAPs show no separate allocation for postage. Half of the projects have budgets for library materials and half have none.

- All RAPs budget for consultants, usually to provide expert presentations at training conferences. The PSU and Alaska RAPs use consultants extensively to supplement staff for on-site services; their budgets for consultant services exceeded $15,000 while the average line item was approximately $6,000. The Region VII RAP had the smallest consultant budget, $1,500.

We have described the organization, nature, and service tasks of the RAP program, and have summarized the funding resources allocated to the RAPs to enable them to carry out the work of assisting Head Starts in serving handicapped children in a wide variety of situations and locales. In the next chapters of this report, the performance of the RAPs is assessed for each of the major tasks that they are contracted to provide.

3.

SERVICES TO GRANTEES

The task of primary importance for the RAP network is to provide services to support the Head Start handicap effort. All of the other RAP task requirements further define this one, or enhance the RAPs' ability to provide services to Head Start grantees.

This chapter provides an overall description of RAP services. Later chapters of the report will treat specific RAP tasks. The first section of this chapter describes the workload: volume, types of activities and task records, types of persons requesting services, and content of services. The second half of the chapter provides an evaluation of the services which RAPs offer, based on the reactions of Head Start recipients.

RAPs provide a wide range of services. Typical requests require diverse skills of the RAP staff. Moreover, it is not uncommon for the topic of a request to extend beyond handicap services into other administrative, health, or educational areas. It is also not uncommon for the request for services to come from a source outside the Head Start community. RAPs also respond to requests for assistance from public schools, resource providers, Head Start regional offices, and Head Start contractors.

A Summary of RAP Activities and Task Records

RAP work is documented using a standardized format. The records are entered into a micro/computer and classified as either activities or task records. An activity is defined as an event initiated by a Head Start, RAP, or another requestor, excluding any specific event relating to a task. A task record is defined as a labor intensive, time intensive event which relates to a specific RAP task. A task record is by nature more substantive than an activity and may take place over a prolonged period of time.

What follows is a summary of findings for RAP activities and task records for the evaluation period July 1, 1982, through March 15, 1983:

- Volume — 4107 activities and 1098 task records were recorded during the evaluation period, an increase of 14 percent and 8 percent, respectively.
- Requestors — 75 percent of all activities identify Head Start programs as the agency requesting RAP service.
- Head Start requestors — Of all activities transacted between RAP and Head Start programs, 44 percent identify the requestor as a handicap coordinator, 20 percent as teaching staff, 19 percent as directors, and 17 percent as other staff, usually administrators.

- Non-Head Start requestors -- 25 percent of all activities identify programs or individuals other than Head Start as the requestors of RAP services: seven percent of the requestors were resource providers, seven percent were individuals or organizations, four percent were initiated by other RAPs, three percent were from state and local education agencies, three percent came from Head Start contractors, and one percent came from the regional and national offices of ACYF.

- Type -- Activities of the RAPs are classed as follows: 61 percent involved the distribution of materials (including the dissemination of the mainstreaming manuals produced by ACYF); 25 percent of the activities involved the provision of information; ten percent required rendering technical assistance, and four percent involved training. In addition, the RAP task records document additional, longer-term efforts in the following categories: 25 percent of the tasks involve meetings; 20 percent involve training; 19 percent involve special projects; 14 percent involve mainstreaming conferences; eight percent deal with collaboration; seven percent deal with technical assistance; four percent involve task forces of the RAP network; two percent deal with needs assessments; and one percent involve the implementation of the RAP Management Information System.

- Providers -- RAPs are the providers of services for 95 percent of all their activities. Other providers include regionally funded Head Start contractors at 3 percent of the total. ACYF regional offices, SEAs, other RAPs, and other miscellaneous providers comprise less than one percent each.

- Content -- 34 percent of all activities identify the subject of the request as administrative services; 26 percent are educational services; 16 percent are children's issues; 13 percent are for intervention services; and 11 percent pertain to instructional issues.

  Each of these topics is described in greater detail below.

Detailed Analysis of Activities

A summary of the findings of RAP activities is presented in Table 3.1 for each RAP and for the network overall. The distribution of activities by volume, type, requestor, Head Start staff level, and provider is comparable to the patterns established in previous years.

Table 3.1

Characteristics of RAP Activities, 1982-1983

	Overall	New England RAP	NYU RAP	REGION III RAP	CHAPEL HILL RAP	NASH-VILLE RAP	MISSIS-SIPPI RAP	U OF I RAP	PORTAGE RAP	TEXAS TECH RAP	REGION VII RAP	DENVER U RAP	LA RAP	PACIFIC RAP	PSU RAP	ALASKA RAP
Volume	4107	243	360	451	444	201	187	242	258	532	298	207	174	132	158	220
Type																
Training	4 %	1	1 %	9 %	1 %	-	-	1 %	2 %	20 %	-	1 %	- %	-	-	1 %
TA	10	14	14	7	5	3	7	10	13	10	7	8	37	4	12	12
Information	25	20	16	16	26	39	17	22	28	17	21	15	31	33	53	51
Materials	61	65	69	68	68	58	76	67	57	53	72	76	32	63	36	36
Requestor																
Head Start	75	81	84	73	64	76	76	75	74	97	85	82	76	40	65	33
Non-Head Start[a]	25	19	16	27	36	24	24	25	26	3	15	18	24	60	35	67
H.S. Staff Level																
Director	19	13	8	10	6	12	2	26	4	64	7	8	5	19	12	22
Handicap Coord	44	43	57	29	46	62	51	56	70	16	41	43	87	33	57	36
Teacher	20	38	7	42	24	19	25	4	13	12	32	31	-	13	7	7
Other[b]	17	6	28	19	24	7	22	14	13	8	20	18	8	35	24	35
Provider[c]																
RAP	95	96	99	100	99	98	100	98	98	76	99	97	100	89	100	91
Other[d]	5	3	1	1	1	3	-	4	2	24	1	4	6	12	2	11

Geographic Distributions: New England: 27% Massachusetts, 30% Connecticut, 9% Maine, 13% New Hampshire, 11% Rhode Island, 7% Vermont, and 3% Other; NYU: 71% New York, 23% New Jersey, 2% Puerto Rico, 1% Virgin Islands, and 3% Other; Region III: 3% Delaware, 22% Pennsylvania, 8% District of Columbia, 5% West Virginia, 35% Maryland, 18% Virginia, and 9% Other; Chapel Hill: 27% North Carolina, 10% South Carolina, 15% Georgia, 13% Florida, and 35% Other; Nashville: 43% Tennessee, 24% Kentucky, 23% Alabama, and 10% Other; Mississippi: 94% Mississippi, and 6% Other; University of Illinois: 42% Illinois, 34% Ohio, 17% Indiana, and 7% Other; Portage: 33% Wisconsin, 26% Michigan, 26% Minnesota, and 8% Other; Texas Tech: 19% Louisiana, 9% Arkansas, 38% Texas, 18% Oklahoma, 13% New Mexico, and 3% Other; Region VII: 31% Iowa, 14% Kansas, 9% Nebraska, 41% Missouri, and 5% Other; Denver University: 36% Colorado, 21% Utah, 4% North Dakota, 9% South Dakota, 11% Montana, 14% Wyoming, and 5% Other; Los Angeles: 87% California, 4% Arizona, 1% Nevada, and 6% Other; Pacific: 67% Hawaii, 5% Guam, 3% Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, 19% Pacific Trust Territory, and 6% Other; Portland State University: 67% Washington, 11% Idaho, 34% Oregon, and 12% Other; Alaska: 92% Alaska, and 8% Other.

Notes: (a) Includes LEAs, SEAs, other RAPs, Regional Office, Resource Providers, etc. (b) Includes personnel from other program components. (c) Percents may total more than 100 when RAP and an other provide services. (d) Includes Regional contractors, resource providers, other RAPs, SEA, Regional Office, etc.

Volume

The number of activities completed by RAPs during the eight and one-half month reporting period was 4107, or about 5800 if annualized. Except for the 1979-1980 reporting period, this is the highest volume to date. Volume has increased 14 percent over the previous reporting period (after adjusting for the additional two weeks in the reporting period for FY'82). On the average, each RAP transacted 32 activities per month.

There is a moderate but not absolute correlation between numbers of grantees and volume of activities. RAPs with many grantees tend to have high volume. Those with the highest volume this year are Texas Tech, Region III, and Chapel Hill. All serve large numbers of grantees, or children, or both. Pacific and PSU had the lowest volume, and both have relatively small numbers of grantees to serve. The number of activities ranged from a high of 532 at Texas Tech to a low of 132 at the Pacific RAP. Five RAPs (Texas Tech, Region VII, NYU, Portage, and Chapel Hill) increased the number of activities transacted; seven had roughly the same number as the previous year, and three RAPs (New England, University of Illinois, and PSU) had fewer activities.

Requestor

RAPs were developed as a support for Head Start programs, and Head Start staff represent 75 percent of all requestors of RAP services. This share has risen since the early years of the program.

Percent of RAP Services Requested By Head Start and Others

	Head Start	Others
1977-78	68	32
1978-79	67	33
1979-80	69	31
1980-81	66	34
1981-82	74	26
1982-83	75	25

The actual number of activities idendtifying Head Start as the requesting party was 3082, an increase of 9 percent over last year and the highest number since the RAP program began.

Others who request RAP services include resource providers, ACYF regional and national offices and their contractors, SEAs, LEAs, and others without affiliate agencies. Network-wide, the distribution of services to non-Head Start requestors breaks out as follows:

- resource providers 7.2 %
- other RAPs 3.6
- SEA/LEA public schools 3.3
- regional contractors 2.9
- Regional Offices 0.8
- others 6.9

This distribution of requests by non-Head Starts is virtually the same as that reported the previous year; there is a slight decrease (.2%) in most categories. The SEA LEA category decreased 1.6 percent compared to last year and the category of "others" showed an increase of 1.4 percent over last year.

Only the Alaska and Pacific RAPs show larger shares of requests from non-Head Start programs (67 and 60 percent respectively). Both of these RAPs serve small numbers of Head Start programs and populations with limited resources. These two RAPs have become resources to the greater communities that they serve. In Alaska, 15 percent of the requests come from public schools; at both RAPs, 23 percent of the requests come from other resource providers; and for both, about one quarter of the requests come from "others".

At most other RAPs, between 15 and 35 percent of the requestors are non-Head Start programs. New England, Region III, Nashville, University of Illinois, and Portage have increased the relative amount of services they provide to non-Head Start programs. Texas Tech and Region VII show a reduced percentage of services to non-Head Start programs. Texas Tech serves Head Start almost exclusively; here only 3 percent of the requestors originated outside the Head Start community.

When Head Start staff ask for RAP service, the actual requestor is most likely to be a handicap coordinator. This again is a predictable circumstance and one established early in the history of the RAP network, as shown below.

Head Start Staff Requesting RAP Activities

Year	Directors	Handicap Coordinators	Teachers	Other
1977-78	28 %	47 %	(No data)	25 %
1978-79	23	32	8	37
1979-80	28	39	16	17
1980-81	19	48	14	19
1981-82	19	44	19	18
1982-83	19	44	20	17

The RAPs are mandated to train teachers at mainstreaming conferences and to distribute mainstreaming manuals, and more and more teachers are being identified as requestors of RAP services. The proportion of Head Start directors using RAP has decreased over the years; interaction with directors may be a little less intensive than it was when the RAP program was new and introducing its services through these administrative channels. "Other" staff are typically component coordinators.

Types of Activities

Activities are classified as one of four types -- training, technical assistance, information, and materials. They are defined as:

- Training: presentation and instruction, usually to develop a skill and given in a group setting. This includes both training which is brokered (arranged for but not paid for by RAP), and training provided by RAP staff that is not labor intensive.

- Information: providing information to requestors, either by telephone or in writing. The response requires minimal technical expertise and interpretation. The primary focus of an information activity is to provide an answer or answers to a question, not lend material. Materials (such as lists, books, bibliographies or policy documents) may accompany the response, but only as a reference or in support of the information supplied.

- Materials: lending or distributing wares including audio-visuals, books, articles, resource kits, equipment, or RAP products. The primary focus of a materials activity is to lend or distribute a ware, not to provide an answer to a specific question or questions.

- Technical Assistance: advice, input, and/or direction requiring specific professional expertise, analysis, or interpretation, most often rendered on a one-to-one basis, either provided or arranged for by the RAP. When this service is provided by the RAP and recorded as an activity, it must be short term. All TA that is brokered (arranged for, but not paid for, by RAP) is also entered as an activity.

The share of all activities classed in each of these categories is presented below, for each of the past six years:

Distribution of Activities by Type, 1977-1982

Transaction Type	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
Brokerage	12 %	8 %	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Facilitation	7	2	3	3	2	N/A
Training	8	5	4	2	3	4
TA	8	5	8	6	6	10
Information	26	29	28	26	24	25
Materials	39	49	57	63	65	61
All Activities	100 %	98 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

In previous years, activities were also classified in categories reflecting the brokerage and facilitation work that RAPs offer. These categories were removed as the system of classification was refined. Now training most commonly appears among task records. Facilitation is usually classed as technical assistance. Relative to the past year, the changes in the distribution of activities have been minimal. Dissemination of materials and the provision of information account for 86 percent of RAP activities. The distribution of the mainstreaming manuals accounts for 19 percent of the materials that were provided by RAP. Because activities, by definition, require minimal time to transact, it is predictable that the dissemination of materials and information account for a substantial share of this part of the workload. The rest of the activities -- 14 percent -- involve training or technical assistance.

There are some variations from this network-wide distribution of RAP activities when data on individual RAPs are examined. Although training represents two percent or less of recorded activities for most RAPs, at Texas Tech it accounts for 20 percent and at Region III, it accounts for nine percent. Texas Tech brokered 126 training events to Head Start programs using LATON staff, a regionally funded contractor also housed at Texas Tech. The Region III RAP developed individual training programs for Head Start staff at a diagnostic nursery within Georgetown University's Child Development Center.

At most RAPs, the share of technical assistance approaches the norm (ten percent of all activities) for the network overall. However, at Los Angeles, 37 percent of the activities are identified as technical assistance in developing collaborative agreements and supporting administrative arrangements within Head Start programs. Information accounts for between one quarter and one third of the activities of most RAPs. But, at PSU and Alaska, information represents over half of the workload.

Many RAPs maintain lending libraries, develop materials, or distribute selected articles on a periodic basis. These practices engender further requests for materials. Moreover, RAPs are also required to disseminate copies of the mainstreaming manuals developed by ACYF. Region III and Region VII RAPs have the greatest number of activities for distributing these manuals; Alaska, PSU, Pacific, University of Illinois, and Portage show very little activity in the distribution of the manuals. The RAPs with the greatest share of materials distribution other than manuals are University of Illinois, Denver, Pacific, Mississippi, and Chapel Hill. Only at Region III does materials distribution play a minor role, accounting for only nine percent of their activities.

Provider Type

This too follows a pattern established in early years of the program: RAP, rather than other providers, is the major source of the services:

Provider Type

	RAP	Others
1978	78 %	21 %
1979	92	8
1980	92	8
1981	92	8
1982	94	6
1983	95	5

In the first years of the RAP program, RAPs were intended to "access the resources" of other existing providers and in fact derived their name from this function. As the expertise of RAP staff became established among their clients, ACYF permitted RAPs to offer services directly, and the instances of RAP-provided services grew progressively. In fact RAP now provides more services to providers than it receives from them.

This year, the analysis of activities shows that fully 95 percent of all services are rendered by RAP staff. RAP staffs may depend upon other providers to obtain information or materials that are passed on to requestors, but this is not documented directly; such support may take the form of informal access to locally available experts and advisors, and similar arrangements stemming from a RAP's history of working with handicap service resources.

Of 4,107 activities analyzed for this year's eight-and-a-half month reporting period, 223, or five percent, did identify a provider other than the RAP. When RAP links a requestor with some other provider, that provider is most often an ACYF regional office contractor (three percent) or an individual with no agency affiliation (one percent). More than half of the instances where resource providers were identified occurred at Texas Tech and involved the LATON services noted above.

Content

When activity forms are filled out, the details of the request are coded by content attributes; any one code or combinations of up to three codes may be used to characterize a RAP activity. There are 46 content attributes which cover the spectrum of RAP requests. The content attributes are listed in Table 3.2, Content Attributes, 1982-1983, organized into broader categories relating to administrative services, intervention services, children's issues, instructional issues, education services, and other services/issues.

Ranked by frequency, the analysis of the content of activity records reveals that the RAP network responds to the following types of requests:

Administrative services	34 %
Education services	26
Children's issues	16
Intervention services	13
Instructional issues	11

In all, 4,962 content attributes were used to describe the tabulated caseload of 4,107 activities; usually one attribute was enough to describe the content. In reviewing the most frequently selected attributes in Table 3.2, one can quickly see the substance of the activities. The first impression of the observer is the great range of subjects for which the RAPs offer assistance. Only one, manuals, constitutes a major share of the caseload, 19 percent. The next most frequently cited attributes were:

mainstreaming	8 %
administrative planning	7
Head Start policy/regulation	6
collaboration	6
staff development	4
speech and language	4
working with parents	4

Legislation/regulation, screening, curriculum, health impairments, assessment, and IEPs accounted for three percent of the activities and each of the other attributes describes two percent or less of the caseload.

Some attributes are rarely selected, fewer than 20 citations for the entire network. Infrequently used attributes include: transportation, nutrition, certification/licensing, blind, deaf, and adaptive equipment/environment. The

Table 3.2

Content Attributes
1982-83

1311	**Educational Services:**			
26%				
	Adaptive Equipment/Environment	19	Classroom Management	45
	Child Development Theory	61	Teaching Methods	88
	Behavior Management	49	Working With Parents	172
	Manuals	805	Other	62
	Nutrition	10		
1660	**Administrative Services:**			
34%				
	Administrative Planning	273	Legislation/Regulation	134
	Certification/Licensing	12	Fiscal Management	68
	Head Start Policy/Regulation	260	Staff Management/Development	174
	Transportation	8	Collaboration	243
	Advocacy	40	Other	396
	Recruitment	52		
633	**Intervention Services:**			
13%				
	Assessment	128	Curriculum	129
	Diagnosis	57	Treatment	31
	Screening	138	Other	33
	IEP	117		
778	**Children's Issues:**			
16%				
	Child Abuse	69	Gifted/Talented	28
	Visual Impairment	44	Mental Retardation	28
	Emotional Disturbance	59	Learning Disabilities	52
	Health Impairment	129	Hearing Impairment	50
	Orthopedic	81	Speech/Language	173
	Blind	12	Other	37
	Deaf	16		
568	**Instructional Issues:**			
11%				
	Multicultural	34	Special Education	56
	Bilingual	44	Mainstreaming	345
	Homebased	55	Other	33

handicaps, blind and deaf, are more apt to be categorized as visual and hearing impairments. The other attributes describe expected, but uncommon, requests for RAP services.

An Analysis of Task Records

The system for recording task records was originally adopted because, soon after the program began, some RAP activities began to take the form of longer-term projects that were by nature more demanding on RAP staff time and expertise than others. Using a single "activity" unit to count a RAP's work led to an apples-and-oranges situation when the activities included both the kinds of swift, quick-response, short-term services discussed above and these more demanding requests for service. When such efforts were redefined as "tasks" and separated from the day-to-day requests, the substantive activities undertaken by individual RAPs were more accurately portrayed and a number of innovative efforts became more evident.

A task record subsumes in it many minor events; e.g., one documenting a conference would typically include such actions as planning meetings, selecting workshop presenters, publicizing the meeting to grantees, locating a site, conducting the conference, developing hand-outs, evaluating the workshops, mailing letters of thanks, and preparing a conference report.

Classification	Examples
Needs Assessment	The process of developing an appropriate form and collecting data on the needs of Head Start programs.
Conferences	State-wide conferences on mainstreaming conducted by RAP staff and consultants. The equivalent of a state-wide conference may be several workshops for clusters of grantees, or planned, on-site training for individual grantees.
Training	Training provided by RAP staff or paid for by RAP staff, conducted on-site or at a large workshop and tailored to the individual needs of the participants.
Technical Assistance	Ongoing or intensive technical support to a new handicap coordinator; development of a plan for services to handicapped children; assisting Head Start staff to locate appropriate services for a blind child; assisting in the implementation of a collaborative agreement between a Head Start program and a public school.

Advisory Committee	The process of selecting members for the RAP advisory committee and conducting the meetings.
Meetings	Presenting at, or attending, meetings of Head Start directors, RAP directors, professional societies, ACYF regional contractors, local handicap coordinaors.
MIS	Implementing the RAPPLE recordkeeping system.
Collaboration	Ongoing efforts faciliated by RAP between Head Start and state and local education agencies, public schools, departments of health, etc., for the benefit of handicapped children.
Task Force(s)	Ongoing participation on one of the RAP networks' task forces.
Special Project	Mass mailings to Head Start programs or other user groups; the development of media; conducting research on RAP related issues; participating in radio or television presentations; developing or maintaining a lending library of materials.

Task records reveal the differing approaches and philosophical leanings of individual projects, such as their relative emphasis on interagency collaboration or on-site training or media development. A summary of task records by type for each RAP is given in Table 3.3. Additional comments on RAP-to-RAP variations in these types of efforts will be found below.

Volume

RAPs recorded 1,098 task records during the eight and one-half month evaluation period. This was the highest volume of any year and represents an increase of almost 8 percent over the previous period. As the display below illustrates, each year there has been an increase in the number of larger-scale projects undertaken by the RAP network:

TASK RECORDS

Year	Volume
1979	393
1980	700
1981	842
1982	1,015
1983	1,098

Table 3.1

Classification of Task Records, 1982-1983

Content of Task Records	Total	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missis-sippi	UofI	Portage	TT	Region VII	Denver U	LA	Pacific	PSU	Alaska
Training	214	28	13	30	9	23	6	5	11	18	7	2	5	16	19	22
Mainstreaming conferences*	161	8	9	11	9	8	6	16	9	12	17	23	12	12	6	3
Collaboration	91	10	5	6	9	11	6	1	5	7	3	7	8	6	3	4
Mass mailings	99	14	13	0	0	5	11	3	18	12	4	2	5	3	4	5
Technical assistance	74	11	8	7	1	6	10	0	3	3	0	2	9	3	11	0
Head Start dir. meetings	66	3	2	4	2	4	0	3	4	13	7	7	1	4	9	3
National RAP meetings	29	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Advisory committee meetings	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Other meetings	166	8	15	9	22	10	23	6	19	8	7	10	9	9	7	4
Task forces	41	3	2	1	4	3	3	2	3	4	2	4	4	0	2	3
Needs assessment/census	19	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	1
MIS	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Special projects	110	3	8	6	9	7	5	8	15	5	8	2	13	4	7	10
TOTAL	1,098	93	79	80	70	83	75	50	92	87	58	64	71	63	74	59
AVERAGE	73															

*or the equivalent

In the 1982-83 program year each RAP recorded 73 task records, on the average. The number of task records increased at five RAPs (New England, NYU, Nashville, Portage, and PSU), decreased at two (Chapel Hill and Texas Tech) and remained relatively stable at the remaining eight.

Portage and New England have the highest number of specific "tasks." Both have numerous mass mailings attributable to their resource-of-the-month services. Portage also recorded attending handicap coordinator meetings and a variety of special projects. New England has the second highest number of training events and a larger than average share of examples of technical assistance.

Lower than average numbers of particular tasks were reported by the University of Illinois, where staff time was concentrated on conferences. The Region VII and Alaska RAPs also had smaller numbers of task records.

Types of Task Records

The proportionate distribution of task records by type for the past three years is shown below. There has been relatively little change over the years:

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
Training	20 %	20 %	17 %	20 %
Mainstreaming conferences	18	18	16	14
Presentations and "other" meetings	13	12	20	15
Technical assistance	8	8	7	7
Mass mailings	8	9	7	9
Collaboration	7	11	8	8
Head Start directors' meetings	5	5	6	6
Advisory committee meetings	3	2	2	1
RAP meetings	3	3	1	3
MIS implementation	2	0	1	1
Needs assessments	2	3	2	2
Task forces	2	3	4	4
Special projects	9	7	10	10

What the percentages do not display are the actual increases in numbers within the categories, which in turn reflect subtle changes in the interpretation of the RAPs' role. The incidence of on-site training events has increased; more RAP staff participated in more task forces; more collaborative efforts were documented; and more information was mailed to grantees.

Training and Technical Assistance

Training is an objective that ACYF has strongly endorsed for the RAP network and one which the RAPs have willingly accepted. In the telephone survey of Head Starts, training was cited as the service provided by RAPs that was most valued by grantees. Of the 15 RAPs, nine also cited "training" when asked in the field interviews to judge which was the most valuable service that they offer. Table 3.4 provides the numbers of training sessions provided by RAPs (exclusive of mainstreaming conferences, which are treated separately in Chapter 4) and the types of recipients.

In contrast to the larger-scale mainstreaming conferences described in Chapter 4, these additional training tasks were highly individualized, custom tailored projects; the modes of delivery, topics offered, and types of recipients were based on separate requests from clients.

RAPs conducted training for grantees individually or collectively, on-site or within the form of a conference. As few as two persons and as many as 150 trainees were accommodated. Overall, 5,704 persons were trained by RAPs at 214 training sessions, in addition to the 15,407 reached at 163 mainstreaming conferences.

Table 3.4

RECIPIENTS OF RAP TRAINING SESSIONS (OTHER THAN MAINSTREAMING)

RAP:	Number Training Sessions	Head Start Trainees:			Non-Head Start Staff	Unspecified Trainees	Total Number Trainees
		Teachers	Aides	Others			
N. Engl.*	28	148	83	273	8	0	512
NYU*	13	32	0	270	0	139	441
Reg. III*	30	307	141	221	237	0	906
Ch. Hill*	9	0	0	75	25	135	235
Nashv.*	23	115	31	126	0	323	595
Miss.*	6	126	0	0	0	300	426
U. Ill.	5	11	4	37	25	67	144
Portage*	11	0	0	31	0	217	248
T. Tech	18	194	149	220	47	230	840
Reg. VII*	7	68	33	51	3	0	155
U. Denv.*	2	1	0	1	0	0	2
L.A.*	5	49	10	13	23	0	95
Pacific	16	126	50	72	5	31	284
PSU	19	83	41	128	74	138	464
Alaska*	22	51	49	69	179	9	357
All RAPs	214	1,311	591	1,587	626	1,589	5,704

Note: Asterisked RAPs conducted a total of 25 additional training sessions for which no data were available on numbers of trainees. Three of these sessions were held by Portage, four at Region III, and at Chapel Hill, and seven at Nashville. The other starred RAPs held one additional session each.

The training topics were diverse. They reveal the great range of needs among Head Starts and the broad variety of expertise available within the RAP network. A few RAPs designed one or more focused training packages for repeated use; whether the training was of this kind or designed strictly for one specific client, it was rendered on an "as needed" basis and was tailored to the individual grantee's needs. New England offered three training packages, on rights and responsibilities of parents, the informing process, and sensitizing. Region III developed a workshop on chronically and critically ill children. Chapel Hill developed the New Friends series in which dolls are used to introduce mainstreaming concepts (which was widely used as well in mainstreaming conferences). Portage provided training on the new handicap services guide. Texas Tech used skill building blocks as a framework for training sessions. PSU and Alaska provided training on collaboration. Many RAPs made use of the TEACH training package on IEPs developed at the Portage Project.

Other RAP training topics cited from task records vary: child abuse, behavior management, warning signs of disabilities, record keeping, speech and language, seizure disorders, training volunteers, computer usage for preschool children, screening for handicaps, parenting, training new Head Start handicap coordinators, administrative planning, health management, language curricula, developing and implementing IEPs, learning disabilities, attitudes toward handicaps, working with gifted children, stress management, hyperactivity, role of social service staff, use of PA26 funds (i.e., funds earmarked for services to handicapped children), developing handicap plans, and more.

Many types of persons were reached by these special training tasks, including Head Start administrative staff, teaching staff, and staff from agencies and institutions outside the Head Start community:

- At least one-third of the recipients were Head Start teaching staff (teachers and aides). These are the persons most directly involved with children with handicaps, and have the responsibility to identify and manage individualized programs for the children.

- About one-quarter of the recipients are other Head Start staff, most commonly handicap coordinators, social service staff, and education coordinators, but also including all other kinds of Head Start positions, from bus drivers to directors. RAPs, in recent years, have developed "training-of-trainers" sessions which may also help to explain increased RAP training of these non-teaching staff.

- Slightly more than 10 percent of the recipients had no affiliation with Head Start. Many were with public schools or day care programs that work cooperatively with Head Start. Some were students who received training from

RAPs. Some were participants in conferences sponsored by professional organizations at which a RAP presented a training workshop.

- About one-quarter of the recipients of RAP training had positions or affiliations undocumented by RAPs.

Special Projects

Among various efforts listed as "special projects" by the RAPs were many new products and media. The development of these products was within the domain of the RAPs' responsibility as contractors, but was not demanded by their scope of work:

- Training packets or manuals:

"Sensitizing," workshop leader's guide (New England)
Severe and profound workshop packet (Region III)
Chronically and critically ill children workshop packet (Region III)
"New Friends" trainer's manual and family album (Chapel Hill)
"Bytes for Tykes" computer training package (Portage)
Handicap coordinators management training packet (University of Illinois, Portage)
"Handicap coordinator as supervisor" training package (Region VII)
Administration and planning workshop package (LA)
"Small Talk" manual (Alaska)

- Media development and publications:

Child abuse slide tape (Chapel Hill)
Issues in mainstreaming media (Chapel Hill)
Region V Handicap Services Guide (University of Illinois, Portage)
New Skill Building Blocks (Texas Tech)
"Changes in Head Start Services to Handicap Children" (LA)
Handicap Services Manual (PSU)
Adaptive Material for the Visually Impaired (Region VII)

- Checklists/organizational aids:

Region VI PIR (Texas Tech)
Chart of resources in New England (New England)
Curriculum checklist (Mississippi)
Calendar of events (University of Illinois)
Criteria for evaluating staff performance on screening and assessment (University of Denver)
Individual planning guide (University of Denver)
Guidelines for writing IEPs (University of Denver)
Planning calendar (LA)

List of children's books by handicapping conditions (Chapel Hill)
Clearinghouse inventory (Region VII)
Parents Guide to Special Education in Alaska (Alaska)

- Screening tools

Speech and language screening tool (Mississippi)
Assessment tool translation into Majuro (Pacific)
Customized assessment tool for Guam (Pacific)

The Head Start Telephone Survey: Assessments of Services to Grantees

The interviews with the Head Starts who use RAP services are crucial to rounding out the picture of these services.

Each year the evaluators have asked the grantees about the assistance they have received from RAPs. The interviews reveal the specific types of services that RAPs are delivering, what Head Starts value the most, and what problems have arisen. When these user assessments are compared with the services which RAPs have documented (i.e., the activity and task records), a determination can be made about RAPs' abilities to meet their clients' needs.

This year a sample of 399 Head Starts was randomly drawn from lists submitted by each RAP. The sample consisted of 30 cases per RAP except for Mississippi, Alaska, and the Pacific RAP; these RAPs serve less than 30 grantees in total, so all Head Starts were included. The only exception to the random selection was to add the largest grantees in New York City, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Los Angeles if they were not randomly drawn, since these grantees consume a large part of those RAPs' services. Interviews were completed with 386, or 97 percent, of the sampled cases. The sample represented 32 percent of the programs listed by RAPs.

Letters were mailed to each Head Start in the sample explaining the evaluation, describing the contents of the interview, and asking the program's cooperation. Both the letters and subsequent interviews were addressed to persons whom RAPs had identified as most familiar with their work. Ninety-three percent of the respondents were the persons that RAP staff usually contact. For the most part, these were handicap coordinators. Occasionally the contact referred us to someone else who was more familiar with the RAP's work. When the initial contact person asked that another person be included in the interview, these responses were synthesized as a composite response for the program.

A standard interview guide was used. The form itself was modified from that used in previous years to facilitate the precoding and automated key entry of the data, but the substance of the questions was retained to permit comparisons with data from previous years. All interviewers were trained to use the same protocol and to code responses identically.

Head Start Clientele Satisfaction with RAP Services

Table 3.5, Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects, 1982-1983, gives the number of cases sampled for each RAP, the proportion of RAP contacts reached, satisfaction with RAP's work, and who initiated contact. Satisfaction with RAPs' work held at last year's high of 3.4 on a 4.0 scale, indicating that, overall, Head Starts continue to perceive the work RAPs do as good or excellent.

Satisfaction has been measured on a four point scale over the years to help quantify Head Starts' evaluations of RAPs' work and allow findings to be compared from one year to the next. "Four" on the scale indicates excellent work; "three," good work; "two," fair work; and "one," poor work. If partial values were given they were tallied (e.g., 3.4, 2.75, 3.2, etc.). To be consistent with previous findings, the overall index was calculated to include respondents who were not willing to give an opinion because there had been too little contact from RAP, which thereby depresses the average score; eliminating these non-respondents would have increased the overall average from 3.4 to 3.5. Non-respondents who declined to give an opinion because they had not had enough contact with RAP were excluded from individual RAP averages, which is why individual scores appear higher than the overall average.

The individual RAP "scores" in Table 3.5 ranged from 3.2 at the Region III and PSU RAPs to 4.0 at the Alaska RAP. The same narrow range appeared last year, although there was some shifting of scores among RAPs. Table 3.6, Comparisons of Individual Satisfaction Scores, 1980-1983, reveals where scores have increased or decreased over the past four years. From 1982 to 1983, the Mississippi RAP shows the most noticeable increase in satisfaction (.6 of a point) while the Region III RAP dropped by .5 a point. Head Starts in Mississippi RAP's service area spoke of RAP's responsiveness to requests and close communication, and were more likely to mention several services when asked which services they valued the most. The Region III RAP's drop reflects Head Start perceptions that they should have closer contact with RAP, or in one case, that they don't need RAP services because they use local providers. These comparisons are relative, however, and each RAP's score remains firmly above 3.0.

Initiation of Contacts

Responsibility for initiating contacts was mutually assumed by RAPs and Head Starts according to 70 percent of the programs. This pattern of reciprocity has been observed over the past four years and is a trend that one would expect in relationships between users and a network which has remained relatively stable. Responsibility for initiating contact still appears to fall more heavily on RAPs where RAP personnel is new, as in Nashville, where 53 percent of the grantees reported RAP-initiated contact, and the University of Illinois, where RAP was the initiator according to 38 percent of the grantees.

TABLE 3.5: REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1982-1983
Number of cases, representation of main contacts, satisfaction, initiation

	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missis-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
Number of Head Starts Surveyed:*	29	28	30	29	30	23	29	30	29	29	30	30	9	28	3	386
Proportion with main RAP contact as spokesperson:	0.93	0.93	0.83	0.93	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.93	0.86	0.97	0.93	0.93	0.89	0.89	1.00	0.93
Satisfaction: Average "Grade" (4.0 scale)**	3.66	3.45	3.23	3.69	3.32	3.83	3.38	3.62	3.50	3.52	3.33	3.32	3.61	3.23	4.00	3.39
Initiator of contacts:																
RAP:	0.28	0.00	0.17	0.17	0.53	0.22	0.38	0.23	0.28	0.17	0.20	0.27	0.11	0.18	0.00	0.23
Head Start:	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.07	0.13	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
Mutual/Both:	0.62	0.86	0.70	0.72	0.47	0.78	0.59	0.73	0.69	0.76	0.67	0.70	0.89	0.82	1.00	0.70
No contact/None:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Don't Know:	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total:***	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Notes: *All respondents, without exception, were familiar with the RAPs.
**Seven cases with little contact and six other "Don't Know" responses excluded from these calculations, except for "All Raps" (see text).
***Proportions based on number of responding Head Starts, above. There were no "No Answer" cases.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3.6

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION SCORES, 1980-83

RAP*	Year:				Change, 1982-1983
	1980:	1981:	1982:	1983:	
New England	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.7	+0.1
New York University	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.5	-0.1
Region III*	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.2	-0.5
Chapel Hill	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7	+0.2
Nashville*	3.4	2.9	3.2	3.3	+0.1
Mississippi	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.8	+0.6
University of Illinois	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	None
Portage	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	-0.1
Texas Tech*	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.5	None
Region VII	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.5	+0.3
University of Denver*	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	None
Los Angeles	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.3	-0.1
Pacific*	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.6	-0.3
Portland State University*	2.8	3.4	3.3	3.2	-0.1
Alaska*	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.0	+0.3
Average for All RAPs	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4	None

Note: * Region III was served by PUSH RAP from 1976-1979, and by the Region III RAP in 1979-present. The Alaska RAP was added to the network in the 1977-78 program year. The Pacific RAP was added in the 1978-79 program year. Texas Tech replaced the University of New Mexico RAP in Region VI in 1978-79. Denver replaced the Mile High RAP in 1980-81; the same year, Portland State University replaced the University of Washington in Region X.

Description of Services Received by Grantees

In 1982-83, Head Starts reported an average of 4.2 different types of contacts with RAPs, a drop from 4.6 last year. (See Table 3.9.) The decline can be traced primarily to a decrease in the number of contacts which fell into the "other" category; that is, fewer Head Starts reported routine telephone contacts from RAPs throughout the year. At the high end, the Alaska RAP averaged 11 types of contacts with each grantee this year, followed by the Pacific RAP which provided approximately seven (6.9) types of service and New England which provided five types (5.0). University of Illinois' respondents reported the fewest types of contacts (2.6).

Each year since 1980, the RAP service most frequently mentioned by Head Start respondents has been mainstreaming training. This year 86 percent of the sampled programs reported they had sent someone to these conferences. (See also the discussion below about the proportion of Head Start teaching staff trained.) That RAPs have been able to sustain this high percentage of Head Start involvement in mainstreaming training after five years speaks to the effort they have made to keep it fresh and relevant. All of the Head Starts we spoke with in the NYU, Alaska, and Pacific RAPs' service areas had sent trainees to RAP conferences. The University of Denver and PSU RAPs reached 97 and 96 percent of our sampling of their clients. At the other end, 48 percent of the Head Start sample in University of Illinois' service area sent trainees, despite the RAP's concentrated efforts to reach more grantees this year. The Nashville, Region III, and Texas Tech RAPs also trained a lower-than-average percentage of grantees.

Mass mailings (68%) and information exchange (61%) both increased slightly from last year. Several RAPs use regular mailings to inform Head Starts of issues or legislation which affect them or to share ideas, techniques, and resources. Information was exchanged about upcoming workshops, recruitment and evaluation materials, specific handicapping conditions, new children, and names of specialists or resources.

The service next most likely to be cited by Head Start respondents was other training provided by the RAP (47%) or arranged for by RAP (9%). Combined, 56 percent of the respondents said they have received training other than the mainstreaming training. Topics of training were discussed earlier in this section under task records. RAP records and respondents at Head Starts both described a large array of topics. Beyond their mainstreaming training, the Pacific, Alaska, and New England RAPs provided or arranged for training for the largest percentage of grantees.

RAPs forwarded materials to 52 percent of the respondents. Grantees in the Pacific rely heavily on RAP for materials, many of which have been adapted or translated by the RAP. A large number of the materials

received by Head Starts in Chapel Hill's service area were for the New Friends package. "Other" types of contacts with RAPs, described by 27 percent of the Head Starts, were regular phone calls to keep in touch, needs assessments, canvass or census calls, collaboration with the SEA, or observations of specific children by the RAP.

Technical assistance arranged for or provided by RAP, cited by 20 percent of the respondents, often revolved around handicap coordinator job descriptions, legal information, collaboration, IEPs and due process, and screening and assessment tools. Again, the Alaska, Pacific, and New England RAPs provided technical assistance services to a higher than average percentage of Head Starts.

Despite perceptions from RAPs that there has been an increased receptivity among Head Starts and LEAs to collaborate, an increased percentage of Head Start/RAP contacts around collaboration has not yet followed. This year seven percent of the respondents mentioned LEA collaboration, a slight decline from last year's average of 11 percent but within the range for the past three years. Evaluators also found fewer requests from LEAs among RAP activity records. RAPs with above average numbers of Head Starts mentioning work involving LEA collaboration during the telehone interviews were primarily the RAPs that also directly facilitated Head Start/LEA agreements this year: New England, Mississippi, University of Denver, Los Angeles, and Alaska. Region III grantees also mentioned RAP's assistance at the local level. This included the District of Columbia grantee's perception that the RAP had provided the draft agreement between Head Start and that jurisdiction's education agency. Other data on types of contacts between RAPs and Head Start grantees can be reviewed in Table 3.7, Reactions of Head Start Staff to the RAP Projects, 1982-1983.

Proportion of Teachers Trained in Mainstreaming Conferences

Among the sample drawn this year, 29 percent of the teachers and 22 percent of the aides had received RAP mainstreaming training. These figures are consistent with those collected from Head Starts last year. The percentage of teachers trained as reported by Head Starts, however, is not quite as high as the percentages reported by the RAPs, i.e., 29 percent compared to 38 percent; the same type of difference was noted last year.

Since the discrepancy is consistent from year to year, it seems clear that there is a bias, but one cannot say with certainty whether the difficulty lies with the data from Head Starts or that from the RAPs. On a RAP-by-RAP basis, Region III, Region VII and Texas Tech were particularly prone to report higher percentages of teachers trained than did the sampled Head Starts in the region, while the University of Illinois RAP reported lower percentages than did its Head Starts.

From the Head Starts' perspective, Pacific RAP trained almost three fourths of their teachers (70%) at mainstreaming conferences, and Region

TABLE 3.7: REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1982-83
Types of Contact With the RAPs

Types of Contact:	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missi-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
LEA Agreements	0.24	0.04	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.13	0.04	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.04	0.67	0.07
HS is a RAP resource	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.24	0.03	0.1	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.05
Dealt w/specific HC	0.17	0.43	0.33	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.11	0.33	0.12
Mass mailings, newsl.	0.73	0.57	0.60	0.83	0.60	0.65	0.13	0.67	0.72	0.90	0.33	0.87	0.44	0.64	0.33	0.68
Information Exchange	0.45	0.79	0.53	0.72	0.20	0.87	0. 6	0.60	0.62	0.66	0.60	0.67	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.61
Materials	0.47	0.57	0.47	0.83	0.43	0.35	0.14	0.67	0.52	0.69	0.57	0.43	0.89	0.46	1.00	0.52
Meetings:																
RAP-sponsored	0.45	0.11	0.10	0.00	0.03	0.17	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.22	0.04	0.00	0.09
Not RAP-sponsored	0.00	0.14	0.07	0.28	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.24	0.14	0.27	0.10	0.22	0.18	0.67	0.13
Advisory Committees	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.22	0.04	1.00	0.03
TATA:																
Training from the RAP	0.78	0.39	0.60	0.41	0.67	0.65	0.17	0.57	0.48	0.52	0.13	0.20	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.47
RAP arranged training	0.38	0.00	0.17	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.33	0.04	1.00	0.09
Tech Assist from RAP	0.35	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.03	0.13	0.07	0.20	0.28	0.28	0.20	0.13	0.78	0.18	1.00	0.20
Mainstream Conferences	0.90	1.00	0.77	0.90	0.73	0.87	0.48	0.83	0.79	0.93	0.97	0.93	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.86
Other Types of Contact*	0.07	0.39	0.40	0.28	0.53	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.21	0.28	0.30	0.03	0.89	0.50	1.67	0.27
Number of Different Types of Contact Reported by Head Starts:	5.00	4.67	4.33	4.79	3.50	4.09	2.58	3.97	4.10	4.62	3.63	3.63	6.89	4.14	11.00	4.20

Notes: * Multiple responses were coded here, which is why Alaska's figure is 1.67. "Don't Know" responses are excluded from calculation of numerator. A separate code for those with no contact with RAP was available but was not used in this item.

TABLE 3.8: REACTIONS OF HEAD START STAFF TO THE RAP PROJECTS: 1982-1983
Percent of teaching staff trained by RAPs, valued RAP services, problems

	New England	NYU	Region III	Chapel Hill	Nash-ville	Missis-sippi	U. of Illin.	Portage	Texas Tech	Region VII	U. of Denver	Los Angeles	Pacific	PSU	Alaska	All RAPS
Proportion of Teaching Personnel trained at RAP Mainstreaming Training Conferences:																
Teachers:	0.40	0.21	0.26	0.21	0.25	0.23	0.56	0.34	0.30	0.65	0.47	0.11	0.70	0.60	0.34	0.29
Teacher's Aides:	0.22	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.17	0.55	0.31	0.22	0.63	0.44	0.04	0.74	0.46	0.35	0.22
All Teaching Staff:	0.31	0.16	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.56	0.32	0.26	0.64	0.45	0.08	0.72	0.54	0.35	0.25
Valued RAP Services:																
Training	0.66	0.75	0.60	0.66	0.60	0.83	0.55	0.50	0.69	0.45	0.47	0.67	0.56	0.75	0.67	0.62
Technical Assistance	0.17	0.07	0.20	0.07	0.13	0.50	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.14	0.10	0.27	0.44	0.18	0.00	0.16
Coming Onsite for T/TA	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.22	0.14	0.33	0.08
Referral to Resources	0.07	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.03	0.30	0.21	0.13	0.03	0.07	0.17	0.23	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.17
Information	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.31	0.10	0.17	0.45	0.27	0.10	0.21	0.07	0.37	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.21
Materials	0.28	0.25	0.13	0.28	0.20	0.13	0.17	0.23	0.17	0.31	0.30	0.07	0.11	0.21	0.00	0.21
Other Services*	0.48	0.07	0.23	0.21	0.07	0.22	0.07	0.23	0.03	0.35	0.27	0.20	0.44	0.11	0.00	0.17
No Contact/Don't Know*	0.03	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.03
Average Number of Types of RAP Services Cited by HS's:	1.96	1.93	1.70	1.69	1.17	2.17	1.55	1.43	1.28	1.66	1.50	1.80	1.78	1.82	1.00	1.65
Problems with RAP: Proportions Saying...																
No	0.93	0.96	0.83	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.93	1.00	0.97	0.93	0.80	1.00	0.89	1.00	0.94
Yes**	0.07	0.04	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.07	0.20	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.06
Total***	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

NOTES: * See text for "others," which are included in percents; "No contact" and "No Answer" responses are included in totals for this table.
** Details provided separately. The most common complaint is that training or other activities are directed too much at entry levels.
*** There were no "No Answer" responses to this item.

VII trained approximately two thirds (65%). The telephone survey revealed that the University of Illinois and PSU RAPs also trained more than half of their teachers, 56 percent and 60 percent, respectively.

Head Starts' Perceptions of The Most Valuable Services Received from RAPs

The most valuable service to Head Starts was decidedly training; 62 percent of the respondents were in agreement. The next most valued services were materials and information provided by RAP, each mentioned by 21 percent.

Evaluators learned that for a number of programs, the simple availability of the RAP was highly important. Among the respondents who mentioned services other than the precoded categories (17%), half specifically mentioned RAPs' availability. Another 17 percent appreciated RAPs' ability to refer them to other resources.

Problems

Problems with RAPs were reported by six percent (6%) of the sampled programs. While not an alarming increase, this is three times the number that described problems last year. Clients of six RAPs had no problems with the services they had received.

Eleven of the 23 complaints were lodged against two RAPs: Los Angeles and Region III. Nonetheless, the overall rate of satisfaction at these RAPs remained high. When responses from these two RAPs are omitted from the computation, the percentage of problems compares similarly to last year.

Among the six problems reported for the Los Angeles RAP, two reflected programs' needs for more substantive training instead of "raising awareness" or providing basic information. A third Head Start felt the RAP had not been able to meet the needs of the program although efforts had been made. A fourth program felt that RAP staff and consultants are not ethnically representative of Head Start, and that RAP has not responded to suggestions that this be corrected. Another respondent has found it difficult to relate to RAP staff in their phone contacts. A sixth problem rose out of a Head Start's frustration at having to duplicate PIR information for RAP's census. Three of the six Head Starts scored their satisfaction with RAP's work as "2," meaning "fair," which had a depressing effect on Los Angeles' overall score.

Of the five problems reported with the Region III RAP, three stemmed from the RAP's unavailability because staff was on the road. One respondent reported no personal contact from the RAP program in four years. Late notices of upcoming conferences were a problem for a fifth respondent. Problems with RAP adversely affected satisfaction scores in two cases.

Table 3.9, Comparisons of Head Start Responses, 1980-83, provides a summary of all of the above data.

Table 3.9

COMPARISON OF HEAD START RESPONSES, 1980-1983

Selected Head Start Survey Items	YEAR			
	1980:	1981:	1982:	1983:
Number Unfamiliar With RAP:	3	0	0	0
Initiation of Contact: Percentages:*				
By the RAP	38%	30%	23%	23%
By Head Start or Clusters	10	7	7	6
Mutual; Both Parties May Initiate	51	60	69	70
No Response	2	3	1	1
Type of Contact: Percentages:**				
Mailings	68%	58%	63%	68%
Information Exchange	33	60	46	61
Materials Obtained	37	46	55	52
TA by RAP or Others	19	19	25	20
Training by RAP or Others	31	37	41	56
Mainstreaming Training	78	81	82	86
LEA Agreements	9	5	11	7
Other Types of Contact	26	23	68	27
Average Number of Types of Contacts per Site:	3.7	3.8	4.6	4.2
Satisfaction: Average Four-Point "Grade":	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4
Percentage With Problems With the RAP:	9%	5%	2%	6%

Notes: * These columns of mutually exclusive frequency distributions may not sum to exactly 100%, due to rounding errors.
** Totals exceed 100%; multiple responses.

RAP Perceptions of Grantee Requests

When asked during on-site interviews whether they had observed major changes in grantees' requests for help over the years, most RAPs (10 of the 15) noted that requests have become more specific. As Head Start personnel have grown more competent and experienced in working with handicapped children, they have become more skilled at articulating their needs, asking in-depth questions, and discussing strategies and applications in their own settings. Instead of asking "What is an IEP?," program staff are now more likely to have specific questions about implementing one. The New England, Los Angeles, Pacific, and Alaska RAPs perceive more interest in local collaboration and coordination on the part of grantees.

RAP staff have also noted that as Head Starts become more competent, they are more likely to contact RAPs for service. Mainstreaming conferences have generated more requests, and some RAPs are as likely to be contacted by parents and teachers as by directors and handicap coordinators.

Barriers to Providing Quality Services

RAPs are most commonly frustrated by the limitations their budgets place on staff and travel. Five RAPs would do more on-site T/TA or collaboration work had they the funds. In order to deliver individualized services, some have had to piggyback commitments and consequently have not always been able to accommodate grantees' timelines. Five RAPs did not identify any barriers to providing quality services.

The next most frequently mentioned problem (by four RAPs) was travel distance, which can inhibit RAPs' flexibility and availability for direct contact. In Alaska and the Pacific, language barriers and inadequate communication systems within the state or among islands also make it difficult for RAPs to stay closely in touch. Two RAPs pointed out that while they may deliver quality services to grantees, they have little control over how grantees apply the training and technical assistance when working with children; these RAPs must make frequent contacts to help Head Start staff follow through. These RAPs are designing materials and training to help handicap coordinators assume some of this responsibility. Another RAP finds it frustrating to train Head Start staff to identify handicapped children knowing there are no professionals to follow-up with diagnosis and treatment.

RAP TRAINING CONFERENCES

Conducting mainstreaming conferences continues to be a task of major importance for the RAPs, consuming a great deal of staff time. All of the RAPs rated this task as a major one. In addition to the planning that began months before the first conferences, as RAPs analyzed grantees' needs assessments and solicited involvement of Head Start staff, RAPs spent a total of 373 days conducting handicap training to Head Start staff this year. In return, Head Start staff identified training as the most valuable service provided to them by the RAPs, as discussed in the previous chapter.

Overall Scale of RAP Mainstreaming Training

There was a sizeable increase in the total number of people trained in the mainstreaming conferences by RAPs in 1982-83 (see Table 4.1). RAP training reached 10,430 teaching staff (including home visitors), an increase of 1,552 from 1981-82. The numbers of other types of trainees also increased. Eighty-seven percent of all Head Start grantees sent staff to RAP training conferences, a slight increase over the previous year.

The increased participation in RAP mainstreaming training conferences continues a trend begun last year. Participation stayed relatively constant at around 11,000 during 1978-1981, when this training was first begun. In 1981-1982, participation rose to over 13,000 and this year it has exceeded 15,000. Eleven RAPs trained more people this year than last; the increase in participation is network-wide except for Region IV, where all three RAPs report decreases in attendance, and Alaska.

The Region VII RAP was an extreme example of growth in training efforts, quadrupling its number of trainees this year. Texas Tech, Portland State University, and Portage also significantly increased their numbers of trainees (increases of 57, 35, and 28 percent, respectively).

Table 4.2, Participation in RAP Mainstreaming Training Conferences, 1982-1983, provides additional information on these efforts. There were 163 conferences in all. RAPs trained 6,716 Head Start teachers and 3,714 teacher aides, representing 38 percent of all teachers and 23 percent of the aides. Overall, 31 percent of all Head Start teaching staff attended RAP mainstreaming conferences, up from 28 percent last year.

As in the past, RAPs varied in the ways they delivered their training. Continuing to stress individualized, on-site training to grantees in its large and sparsely populated region, the University of Denver RAP again conducted the most conferences, 23. The Region VII and University of Illinois RAPs also conducted more conferences than last year, in a concerted effort to reach more teaching staff. Each increased its numbers of teaching staff trained as well as the numbers of grantees

Table 4.1

STAFF TRAINED BY RAPS AT MAINSTREAMING CONFERENCES, 1979-83

	1978-1979:	1979-1980:	1980-1981:	1981-1982:	1982-1983:
Number of Grantees With Staff Participating in Conferences	1,033	942	887	913	936
Number of Trainees:					
Teaching Staff	8,660	8,216	7,815	8,878	10,430
Other Personnel	2,636	3,236	3,272	4,400	4,977
Total Trainees	11,296	11,452	11,087	13,278	15,407

Table 4.2

PARTICIPATION IN RAP MAINSTREAMING TRAINING CONFERENCES, 1982-83

RAP	Number of Conferences	Percent Attending Training Conferences, of All:			
		Grantees	Teachers	Aides	Teaching Staff
New England	7	96%	50%	8%	28%
NYU	9	98	28	14	21
Region III	11	95	57	30	44
Chapel Hill	9	88	22	10	16
Nashville	8	73	18	10	14
Mississippi	6	87	17	14	16
U. of Illinois*	15	64	32	27	30
Portage	9	95	44	34	39
Texas Tech	15	79	67	44	56
Region VII	17	99	89	83	86
U. of Denver	23	91	55	43	49
Los Angeles	12	96	21	8	15
Pacific	12	92	76	51	68
Portland State U.	7	88	49	22	37
Alaska	3	100	26	36	32
All RAPs	163	87%	38%	23%	31%

Note: *This RAP also held a joint mainstreaming training conference in collaboration with Region VII RAP. The conference itself is counted with the Region VII data, but each RAP was credited with the attendees from its own region.

attending. These two RAPs held one joint conference in St. Louis, a first for the RAP network. The Region III RAP was the only one which trained more people than last year while reducing the number of conferences it held. This RAP also reached additional grantees.

Head Start teachers and aides are an important target group for RAP training. RAPs were instructed to reach one-third of the teachers in their Head Starts each year. In the first year of conferences (1978-1979), Head Start teaching staff comprised 77 percent of a total of 11,296 RAP trainees. In 1982-1983, the fifth year of training conferences, teaching staff comprise 67 percent of 15,407 trainees. Although the proportionate share for the teaching staff has gone down, the actual number of teaching personnel reached by RAP training increased sharply this year, to about 120 percent of the 1978-79 levels. RAPs still concentrate on Head Start teaching staff at mainstreaming conferences although some RAPs also plan training for other component staff.

The two RAPs which had reached high proportions of teaching staff last year -- Pacific and University of Denver -- again trained high percentages of the teaching staff in their service areas (68% and 49%, respectively). The most notable coverage of Head Start teachers and aides was achieved, however, at the Region VII RAP, which trained 86 percent of its teaching staff, this year's highest percentage. In 1981-1982 this same RAP had the lowest rate of participation by teaching staff -- 15 percent. In RAP evaluations since 1976 we cannot recall another instance where a RAP jumped from the anchor position to first place in one of these measures in just a single year. It clearly demonstrates the significant effort the RAP made this year to reach teachers and aides in Region VII. Other RAPs also increased their coverage of teaching personnel. Texas Tech reached 67 percent of the Head Start teachers in its region and trained 56 percent of all teaching staff. Region III RAP reached 57 percent of the teachers and 44 percent of all teaching staff.

Five RAPs reached comparatively low numbers of the teaching staff in their areas -- Chapel Hill, Nashville, Mississippi, NYU and Los Angeles. The three Region IV RAPs experienced not only a drop in their coverage of area teachers and aides but also declines in the total number of persons trained. The most dramatic changes occurred at the Nashville RAP, where only 14 percent of teaching staff were trained, only half as many people were trained as the previous year, and fewer grantees sent staff to RAP conferences. NYU and Los Angeles RAPs targeted groups of non-teaching staff in addition to teaching staff and increased their total attendance.

Three years ago, RAPs were given the option to train social service and home-based staff as well as teaching staff at mainstreaming conferences. Training designed specifically for social services staff and home-based staff was developed to promote intercomponent coordination, strengthening the delivery of handicap services to children and families. This year the NYU RAP focused on Head Start social services staff, as it has in

recent years, and on supervisory staff in Puerto Rico. Los Angeles RAP held two conferences for component coordinators. The Portland State University RAP has always offered training specifically for Head Start family services workers. New England encouraged health staff to attend this year--hospital nurses, Public Health nurses, Health Committee members--since it designed handicap training around the theme of hospitalization. Such focus on training other groups may account for the lower-than-average proportions of Head Start teaching staff trained at the NYU and Los Angeles RAPs and of aides at the New England RAP. Further discussion of target groups trained by RAPs will be found in the following section.

Over the years, RAPs have adopted new materials, focuses, and approaches to keep the training up-to-date for Head Start staff and to provide appropriate follow-up training for previous participants. Handicap services training of a broad generic nature has given way to more in-depth specialized topics. RAP evaluation reports from past years have chronicled these trends as they have developed. This year, the New Friends training package was adopted networkwide, paralleling the social services training initiative of 1981-82.

New Practices and Strategies

An array of new practices and strategies contributed to the success of this year's conferences. RAPs designed training for target groups of trainees other than teachers and aides, provided further specialization or in-depth treatment of topics, and incorporated new resources into the conferences agendas. Four RAPs provided separate training for Head Start staff with different responsibilities related to the handicap effort. Several conducted train-the-trainer sessions at some conferences, to increase local training capabilities. New Friends was incorporated by 11 RAPs into nearly 40 percent of all the conferences.

Most RAPs provided specific training for non-classroom staff, most commonly social services (five RAPs) and homebased staff (four RAPs). The University of Denver RAP targeted both of these groups as well as parents. The NYU and Los Angeles RAPs held training for social services and homebased workers. Chapel Hill provided separate training for administrators to acquaint them with the resources of public and private agencies working in handicap services in their regions. The University of Illinois RAP provided full-day sessions for administrators as trainers on interagency collaboration. The Region VII RAP trained parents and social services staff, while Region III targeted coordinators. Health staff were encouraged to attend conferences conducted by both the New England and Portland State University RAPs. The Alaska RAP invited special education aides from the local education agencies.

Most RAPs also made a concerted effort to involve new resources, both people and materials, in this year's conferences. Head Start parents and staff members, siblings of handicapped individuals, adults with disabilities, representatives of Head Start T/TA systems, and LEA staff

were invited to make presentations. The New England and NYU RAPs developed new conference materials for dissemination. Los Angeles RAP contracted with commercial vendors to display their products at the conferences. The Portland State University RAP set aside one of three training "tracks" to address each cluster's individual training needs, using local consultants who would be more available to the grantees. Chapel Hill RAP's conferences emphasized "mutual resources" available to both Head Start and other agencies. The Pacific and Alaska RAPs used or helped develop new material for their Aleut and Micronesian trainees.

The New Friends training package developed by Chapel Hill RAP was widely used by RAPs in this year's training. New Friends helps to introduce handicaps to young children, emphasizing a wider context of individual differences. This package includes patterns for New Friends dolls, information on specific handicapping conditions, training guides, and a slidetape. Several RAPs modified New Friends for their own purposes. For example, the NYU RAP used New Friends to surface attitudinal issues regarding handicaps, to promote the integration of roles of various Head Start staffs working with handicapped children, and to discuss how to introduce new material into the classroom. The Mississippi RAP emphasized New Friends as a tool for children's transition from Head Start to public school, and for promoting interaction between teachers in the two settings. Similarly, Portage RAP trained administrative staff as New Friends trainers, encouraged sharing the dolls with public schools, devoted one newsletter to the subject, and made dolls available on a loan basis. Having first introduced the New Friends concept to all handicap coordinators and directors, the Region VII RAP presented it at 15 of its conferences; New Friends training led to sessions on answering children's questions about handicaps, specific handicapping conditions, involving parents in the curriculum, and issues involved in mainstreaming.

With hindsight, most RAPs would change some aspect of this year's conferences if they could. Largely, these changes reflect planning decisions. New England, NYU, and University of Illinois RAPs would have scheduled their conferences differently, leaving more time between each one. The University of Illinois RAP would have held even more conferences than it did to reach grantees in remote parts of its service area, while Nashville would have held fewer conferences and used consultants more as a means to reduce the burden falling directly on RAP staff. The Portage RAP also senses a need for additional staff when conducting a two-day training conference. Texas Tech University would have scheduled its conferences earlier in the year.

Portage, Texas Tech, Portland State University, and other RAPs encountered problems with facilities or locations chosen this year. The Portland State Unversity RAP would increase its effort to orient local specialists to Head Start policies and practices. Constrained for years to limit the length of each conference to one day, the Los Angeles RAP would like to plan two-day training in the future, especially to reach coordinators, and would also expand the role of vendors invited this

year, from merely displaying their wares to demonstrating them. Finding much greater interest in behavior management training than anticipated, Los Angeles would plan more sessions on that topic, while the Chapel Hill RAP would increase it emphasis on severe handicaps and would conduct more train-the-trainer sessions for administrators.

The most common problems reported by the RAPs regarding their conferences related to the weather and to choices of training sites or facilities. Several RAPs raised concerns about the rising costs of conducting conferences. The Pacific RAP was forced to cancel a conference on Kuaui following a hurricane that devastated the island in November and to replan the training focus and schedule in Truk following a cholera epidemic. In addition to such problems as conflicts with other training events, lack of time, last-minute cancellations by presenters, and tardiness of participants returning from breaks, several RAPs mentioned those of staff illness and the sheer physical strain of traveling to sites with necessary materials and equipment.

Poor weather conditions kept grantees from attending training at four RAPs. More frequent reasons why grantees did not attend conferences, however, were time conflicts (holidays, other grantee training, IDVs, etc.) and grantees' lack of interest (training would be repetitive, staff is sufficiently trained), accounting for nearly one-third of all absences. Other reasons included lack of funds, long distance, programs that were new or had closed, and indecision at the agency level. Nearly half of all absences could not be accounted for.

Evaluating The Training Conferences

RLA's evaluation of the RAP's response to the task of providing mainstreaming training has been based directly on the reactions of the participants, using a questionnaire distributed to the trainees at the conferences plus follow-up telephone interviews with a small sample of respondents contacted at least three months after their training took place. The evaluation questionnaires were distributed at 47 of the 163 conferences, yielding 2,767 sealed returns sent to the evaluation staff for tabulation and analysis. Table 4.3 provides information on the number of cases obtained for each RAP in this sample.

The evaluation questionnaire was similar to those used in the past -- indeed, most items were deliberately matched with their counterparts in earlier surveys of RAP trainees, to facilitate comparisons over time. However, like the telephone survey of Head Starts discussed in the previous chapter, the format of the survey instrument was revised to accommodate its processing with a new microcomputing system, and some items were modified, expanded, or changed in other ways to bring them up-to-date with topics currently addressed in the training conferences. One RAP could not make use of the revised questionnaires (see footnote two in Table 4.3); comparisons of its responses to those obtained at the other RAPs help to identify ways in which these changes in questionnaire wording affected the results. Additional comments are provided below.

Table 4.3: NUMBER OF STATE TRAINING CONFERENCES AND TRAINING PARTICIPANTS, BY RAP

RAP:	Conferences:		Participants:		
	Total Number:	Number Evaluated	Total Number:	Evaluat'n Responses	Long-Term Cases:*
New England	7	2	728	112	2
NYU	9	2	1680	483	0
Region III****	11	3	1655	243	2
Chapel Hill	9	2	913	151	1
Nashville	8	2	581	114	1
Mississippi****	6	2	509	167	2
U. of Illinois***	15	4	1638	165	3
Portage****	9	2	1201	128	1
Texas Tech****	15	3	2437	184	2
Region VII****	17	5	1469	374	3
U. of Denver****	23	6	711	181	5
Los Angeles****	12	3	951	277	2
Pacific**	12	6	371	97	3
PSU****	7	2	525	65	2
Alaska	3	3	38	26	1
ALL RAPS:	163	47	15407	2767	30

*Numbers of evaluation respondents from each RAP included in a subsample of participants interviewed by telephone at least three months after their training.

**This RAP used the 1981-82 version of the training conference evaluation questionnaire, as all of its conferences take place very early in the program year. These earlier survey forms differ in a number of details from those used at other RAPs. See footnotes on subsequent tables for further information. In addition, an extra Pacific conference was processed as test data for the RAP evaluation project's new microcomputer-based survey data processing system; the data for that conference is similar to that for the others convened by this RAP, so they were retained in the analysis even though not selected in the project sample.

***166 cases received; one lost in processing. In addition, this RAP held a joint conference with the Region VII RAP which is tabulated with the other Region VII activities.

****Includes 22 IMPD trainees, as follows: Region III, 1; Mississippi, 3; Portage, 4; Texas Tech, 2; Region VII, 3; University of Denver, 1; Los Angeles, 4; PSU, 4.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Trend in Conference Size

One reason RAPs are reaching more trainees is that many of them are having larger conferences. Overall, average attendance at RAP training conferences in 1981-82 was about 79 persons; in 1982-83, this figure rose to 95 persons. As in the past, the NYU RAP held the largest meetings, averaging 187 trainees each, an increase from 1981-82 when this RAP averaged 158 trainees per conference. Region VII had even sharper increases; it nearly doubled average attendance and more than doubled the number of training conferences it staged. Region III, Portage, Texas Tech, PSU, and Chapel Hill all increased the average attendance at their conferences, as well; Chapel Hill's total participation slipped because fewer conferences were offered, not because typical participation fell off. Nashville's results were noted above. Other RAPs had results similar to those in 1981-1982, or experienced offsetting changes (for example, Alaska reached roughly the same number of participants as in the past although fewer conferences were held). As before, these variations reflect regional influences, especially varying population densities, that lead RAPs to differ in these preferences for large or small meetings. For example, the more densely settled areas, such as those served by NYU, can more feasibly be reached with a small number of larger meetings.

Background of Trainees

Ninety-seven percent of the surveyed respondents were Head Start staff, virtually the same as last year. The proportion of trainees that were teaching staff is also the same as in 1981-82, holding at 64 percent, compared to 72 percent in 1980-81.

Detailed breakdowns of the background of trainees for all 15 RAPs are provided in Table 4.4. To avoid confusion with the data discussed earlier for Table 4.2, we would point out that those figures showed that 38 percent of all Head Start teachers participated in RAP training in 1982-83; the statistics in Table 4.4 indicate these teachers made up 35 percent of all participants in the training. Aides made up another 23 percent of trainees. There is some variation from RAP to RAP in the mix of teaching staff trained. For example, 12 percent of the Alaska trainees, but 57 percent of the Mississippi trainees, were Head Start teachers; 11 percent of the PSU, and 42 percent of the Alaska trainees were aides; 17 percent of the Portage trainees were home visitors, but none of the Alaska trainees were home visitors. Overall, Mississippi trainees were most likely to be Head Start teaching staff (92%); NYU trainees were least likely to be in this category (49%).

Other Head Start personnel made up the bulk of the remaining trainees. As noted above, New York University made a particular effort to reach social service staff and was successful in doing so. About a quarter of all trainees surveyed at the PSU conferences, and about a fifth of those at the New England, Region III, and Nashville conferences, were "other"

TABLE 4.4: BACKGROUND OF RAP TRAINING PARTICIPANTS: TYPES OF TRAINEES, BY RAP
(Note: proportions shown--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. All figures are rounded)***

RAP:	Head Start Staff: Teaching Staff: H.S. Teachers	Teaching Aides	Home Visitor	Total, Teaching	Other Staff: Social Service	H.S. Parent	Other Admin*	All Others**	Total, Head Start:	Non-Head Start:	No Answer to item	Total, All Trainees
New England	0.38	0.16	0.05	0.60	0.11	0.00	0.21	0.09	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
NYU	0.29	0.14	0.06	0.49	0.29	0.01	0.17	0.03	0.99	0.00	0.01	1.00
Region III	0.38	0.22	0.08	0.68	0.03	0.02	0.20	0.05	0.98	0.02	0.00	1.00
Chapel Hill	0.35	0.21	0.03	0.58	0.06	0.02	0.15	0.06	0.87	0.09	0.03	1.00
Nashville	0.46	0.21	0.05	0.73	0.01	0.01	0.22	0.02	0.98	0.01	0.01	1.00
Mississippi	0.57	0.34	0.01	0.92	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.02	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
U. of Illinois	0.31	0.24	0.07	0.62	0.07	0.02	0.17	0.10	0.98	0.01	0.02	1.00
Portage	0.22	0.23	0.17	0.63	0.11	0.05	0.16	0.04	0.98	0.02	0.00	1.00
Texas Tech	0.41	0.33	0.02	0.77	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.99	0.01	0.00	1.00
Region VII	0.25	0.28	0.07	0.60	0.08	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.93	0.06	0.01	1.00
U. of Denver	0.20	0.22	0.13	0.55	0.05	0.06	0.15	0.15	0.97	0.03	0.01	1.00
Los Angeles	0.44	0.24	0.07	0.75	0.06	0.00	0.17	0.01	0.99	0.01	0.00	1.00
Pacific	0.46	0.31	0.03	0.80	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.95	0.01	0.04	1.00
PSU	0.37	0.11	0.09	0.57	0.08	0.00	0.26	0.08	0.98	0.02	0.00	1.00
Alaska	0.12	0.42	0.00	0.54	0.04	0.00	0.12	0.08	0.77	0.23	0.00	1.00
ALL RAPS:	0.35	0.23	0.07	0.64	0.09	0.02	0.15	0.06	0.97	0.02	0.01	1.00

*Includes Head Start Directors, Component Coordinators, consultants (identifying themselves as Head Start staff) handicap specialists, and other professional personnel.
**Includes assistants and aides, clerks, nurses, cooks, drivers, foster grandparents, etc., plus others identifying themselves as Head Start staff but not indicating their positions. See text for details on "other" types of trainees and information on trainees who were not Head Start personnel.
***Proportions are based on total cases, given in Table 4.3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Head Start administrative staff — directors, component coordinators, etc. Fifteen percent of the University of Denver's trainees were still other Head Start workers such as nurses, support staff like cooks and drivers, etc. Non-Head Start people comprised only a small share of the trainees and consisted mostly of LEA or SEA staff, students, or interested private citizens and observers.

Two additional kinds of background information were available for these trainees: whether or not they worked with handicapped children, and whether they had experienced RAP mainstreaming training before (see Table 4.5). Overall, at least 79 percent of the trainees did work with handicapped children, either directly or indirectly. Fifty-nine percent worked directly with handicapped children, virtually the same as the proportion reported in previous years. There are shifts among individual RAPs that may be of interest. For example, Mississippi trainees were considerably more likely than in the past to report direct contact with handicapped children -- 54 percent in 1982-1983, compared to 37 percent in 1981-1982. Despite this increase, trainees at this RAP are still more likely than those anywhere else to have no contact with handicapped children.

The other background item, prior exposure to RAP training, was virtually unchanged, overall, from results in 1981-1982, when the number of participants who had been previous RAP trainees jumped to 46 percent, compared to 32 percent in 1980-81. RAPs where the proportion of trainees who have been previous participants rose significantly in 1982-83 included Portland State University (where it doubled to 60 percent) Pacific, and Mississippi. Those which trained more people for the first time than before included Chapel Hill (from 29% with no prior exposure to RAP training in 1981-1982 to 52% in 1982-1983) and Region VII. These statistics are influenced by Head Start staff turnover and the size of Head Start staff in the various service regions.

Overall Satisfaction

As in the past, sampled respondents were invited to rate their training on an "Excellent"/"Good"/"Fair"/"Poor" basis, with the scores coded on the usual academic four-point scale ("Excellent"=4, "Good"=3, etc.). Overall ratings were nearly identical to those in 1981-82. Combined ratings ranged from 3.76 to 3.25 and the overall mean for all respondents to the evaluations surveys was 3.53. On a RAP-by-RAP basis there were a few shifts from last year's outcomes. Chapel Hill and Texas Tech did not get the very high averaged ratings that these RAPs had for training in 1981-1982, but their scores are still very good ones. Nashville, the University of Denver, Los Angeles, Portland State University, and the Pacific RAP all improved their ratings, compared to the previous year. Pacific's rating in 1981-82 was already a high one, and for the current year its satisfaction scores exceed those for any other RAP (77% of the trainees said Pacific's training was "excellent"). Only one RAP, that at the University of Illinois, had less than 50 percent of its trainees judge the conferences as "excellent." This RAP's average rating for all

TABLE 4.5: ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND OF TRAINEES: WORK W/HC CHILDREN; PREVIOUS RAP TRAINING
(Note: proportions shown--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. All figures are rounded)*

RAP:	Work With Handicapped Children?					Attend RAP Training Before?			
	Yes, Direct	Yes, Indirect	No Contact	No Ans.	Total, All:	Yes, Before	No--New Trainee	No Answer	Total, All:
New England	0.55	0.29	0.11	0.05	1.00	0.46	0.45	0.09	1.00
NYU	0.52	0.28	0.15	0.05	1.00	0.41	0.51	0.08	1.00
Region III	0.65	0.19	0.13	0.03	1.00	0.51	0.42	0.07	1.00
Chapel Hill	0.58	0.25	0.16	0.01	1.00	0.41	0.52	0.07	1.00
Nashville	0.66	0.25	0.06	0.04	1.00	0.54	0.39	0.07	1.00
Mississippi	0.54	0.07	0.34	0.05	1.00	0.51	0.43	0.06	1.00
U. of Illinois	0.47	0.19	0.28	0.07	1.00	0.51	0.42	0.07	1.00
Portage	0.58	0.23	0.16	0.04	1.00	0.60	0.34	0.06	1.00
Texas Tech	0.66	0.14	0.14	0.06	1.00	0.38	0.49	0.13	1.00
Region VII	0.58	0.16	0.20	0.06	1.00	0.36	0.53	0.11	1.00
U. of Denver	0.65	0.16	0.15	0.04	1.00	0.54	0.41	0.05	1.00
Los Angeles	0.61	0.18	0.13	0.08	1.00	0.39	0.49	0.12	1.00
Pacific	0.70	0.09	0.14	0.06	1.00	0.68	0.26	0.06	1.00
PSU	0.72	0.26	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.60	0.31	0.09	1.00
Alaska	0.58	0.12	0.23	0.08	1.00	0.54	0.38	0.08	1.00
ALL RAPS:	0.59	0.20	0.16	0.05	1.00	0.46	0.46	0.08	1.00

* Proportions are based on total number of cases, given in Table 4.3.

responding participants for training was relatively low for the RAPs last year and is somewhat lower yet this year (see Table 4.6).

The respondents were invited to add comments when they rated their training, and many did so. Those who gave "excellent" responses -- a majority of all the trainees -- tended to be complimentary in their comments and to identify particular topics they thought were handled well or particular presentations they liked. Such comments tended to be similar to responses to the question about what trainees liked best (see below). Those who gave "good" (or rarely, "fair" or "poor") responses were more prone to be critical, and their comments often provide guidance for the RAPs on things to avoid in carrying out training. A sampling of these more critical comments, from all of the RAPs:

- "IEP session poorly planned. The rest was excellent."
- "Some sessions were repetitious."
- "As a center teacher I felt it was lacking in concrete ideas."
- "Not so much review of what we already know."
- "On first day, lectures were mediocre, read too much."
- "One workshop was poor, others were excellent."
- "Was not introduced to any new materials."
- "Didn't feel session hit on handicapped children like it should."
- "One of the trainers wasn't prepared, very boring."
- "It would be helpful if all the presenters knew something about Head Start."
- "Talked down to us a lot."
- "Wasn't designed for home visitors; mostly classroom situations."
- "Presenter didn't talk about his topic; very opinionated, close-minded."
- "Needed more time for presentations, discussions, questions and answers."
- "Trainer did not seem to have solid early childhood background."
- "Session next door was too loud."

TABLE 4.6: SATISFACTION WITH MAINSTREAMING TRAINING, BY RAP
(Note: average "grade" weighted as shown, with "no answers" excluded)

RAP:	Proportion Rating Satisfaction as:					Total, All:	Average "Grade"*
	Excellent(=4)	Good (=3)	Fair (=2)	Poor (=1)	No Answer		
New England	0.53	0.45	0.02	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.51
NYU	0.50	0.41	0.06	0.00	0.03	1.00	3.45
Region III	0.56	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.56
Chapel Hill	0.62	0.36	0.02	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.60
Nashville	0.61	0.37	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.60
Mississippi	0.69	0.29	0.01	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.70
U. of Illinois	0.34	0.54	0.08	0.01	0.03	1.00	3.25
Portage	0.50	0.45	0.03	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.48
Texas Tech	0.55	0.41	0.02	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.54
Region VII	0.54	0.45	0.01	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.53
U. of Denver	0.59	0.40	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.57
Los Angeles	0.54	0.42	0.02	0.00	0.02	1.00	3.53
Pacific	0.77	0.22	0.01	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.76
PSU	0.52	0.38	0.08	0.02	0.00	1.00	3.42
Alaska	0.62	0.31	0.08	0.00	0.00	1.00	3.54
ALL RAPS:	0.55	0.41	0.03	0.00	0.01	1.00	3.53

*Average "grade" computed on the usual 4.0 system, as weighted above, "No Answer" cases excluded. Other proportions based on total cases as given in Table 4.3.

Almost all RAPs had some of these kinds of criticisms. The complete list of all comments provided with trainees' ratings is being supplied to each of the RAPs as feedback that may be of use in planning next year's training sessions. A separate listing of what trainees said they "liked best" about the conferences (see below) is also being sent.

Conference Topics

As in the past, the evaluation form asked respondents to check off the topics covered in workshops they attended. The format of this question was changed from that used in previous years; a number of new topics were added, but the list of specific handicapping conditions provided in the earlier surveys was replaced by an open-ended item in which respondents could list the specific handicaps addressed in their workshops. These changes may have affected how respondents answered this item (see especially footnote two in Table 4.7 and footnote one in 4.8). Some RAPs seem to have had more of a variety of workshop offerings than others. The average number of topics cited per respondent varies from four at the Pacific RAP to over nine at the Alaska RAP.

In earlier years — specifically, in 1980-81 and again in 1981-82 — information about specific handicapping conditions was by far the most common topic reported by workshop participants, and individualized planning was the second most common topic; recruitment was the least-cited topic. These patterns have shifted in 1982-83. "Information about specific handicaps," far from being the most commonly cited workshop topic (mentioned by 82% of the respondents in 1981-82), is now cited by only 28 percent of the trainees. "Mainstreaming" -- which is, after all, the overriding theme of all of this training -- is now the most commonly cited workshop topic, mentioned by 65 percent of all trainees (compared to 45% in 1981-82). This is followed closely by sessions on "Working with families of the handicapped," cited by 63 percent. (Here there is no direct comparison with earlier data; the equivalent topic was categorized in earlier evaluations of RAP training under two separate headings, "Parent-teacher relations," cited by 50% in 1981-82, and "Parent involvement," cited by 46% in 1981-82.) Cited nearly as often this year was "Attitudes toward the Handicapped," a workshop topic checked by 60 percent of the 1982-83 trainees.

Three topics were named by substantial pluralities of the trainees: "Planning for each child," (which is similar to the "Individualized planning" code checked frequently by these trainees in the past) cited by 47 percent; "Behavior management," cited by 46 percent; and "Curriculum techniques," cited by 42 percent. "Screening," "Assessment," and "Diagnosis" are cited by 32 percent, 37 percent, and 31 percent of the trainees, respectively; these results are roughly comparable to those obtained for the same topics in the past. Other topics are mentioned by no more than a quarter of the trainees. "Working with public schools" is now the least-cited workshop topic, at 13 percent of the trainees; this topic was added to the list on the survey form this year for the first time. "Recruitment," formerly the least-cited topic, was not included at all in the revised list used for the 1982-83 survey forms, but was mentioned occasionally as an "other workshop" topic. Additional "other" citations are listed in footnote three of Table 4.7.

Individual RAPs still show some degree of variation from these general trends in the content of RAP training, but the departures from the overall result seem less dramatic than has sometimes been the case in previous evaluations of RAP training. In 1981-82, only the Los Angeles RAP reflected national-level distributions of training topics when these were compared at the local levels. This is no longer the case. The general mix of workshops described for the program as a whole also applies fairly well to the data for individual RAPs in Table 4.7, especially if allowances are made for differences in the propensity to name many different topics. The more evident departures from the national norms are limited to:

- New England, which (as noted above) had a special hospital-services-oriented training program this year;
- Mississippi, and also Pacific and Alaska, which seem to retain an interest in learning more about specific handicaps that is not detected in such strength at most other RAPs (the University of Denver's trainees also show more interest in specific handicapping conditions than most);
- Portage, where trainees were especially likely to cite training in abuse and neglect of the handicapped;
- Texas Tech, which seems to blend both the newer emphasis in handicap services on teachers' attitudes and service to families, and the older "fundamentals" of screening, assessment, and planning for each child (other RAPs, including Pacific, PSU, and Alaska also seem to merit this description);
- Denver, which seems particularly oriented to classroom-technique training (high levels of citations for workshops in curriculum techniques and behavior management; a similar pattern can be seen in the data for Alaska); and

TABLE 4.7: WORKSHOP TOPICS CITED BY TRAINING CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS, BY RAP

(Note: Proportions cited--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, e.g., 73%. Totals add to well over 1.0 (100%) due to multiple responses.)

RAP:	Percent Citing Attendance in Workshops on:																		Average Number of Topics Cited:
	Screening	Assessment	Diagnosis	Mainstreaming:	Planning for Each Child:	Developing IEP's, etc.	Supervision of HC Efforts	Curriculum Techniques:	Work with Public Schools	Component Coordination	Work with Families	Attitudes toward the HC	Behavior Management	Gifted HC Children	Abuse/Neglect of the HC	Severely HC Children	Specific HC Conditions*	Other Topics ***	No Answer	
New England	0.37	0.54	0.52	0.41	0.40	0.14	0.14	0.45	0.14	0.13	0.46	0.54	0.70	0.06	0.11	0.14	0.27	0.21	0.01	5.78
NYU	0.31	0.45	0.44	0.66	0.45	0.16	0.26	0.48	0.09	0.36	0.81	0.75	0.56	0.28	0.23	0.19	0.24	0.07	0.02	6.84
Region III	0.40	0.45	0.41	0.49	0.43	0.17	0.14	0.33	0.12	0.12	0.41	0.38	0.35	0.10	0.09	0.19	0.16	0.19	0.03	4.95
Chapel Hill	0.25	0.24	0.28	0.87	0.64	0.45	0.30	0.57	0.30	0.38	0.66	0.59	0.57	0.60	0.22	0.38	0.23	0.10	0.03	7.64
Nashville	0.14	0.11	0.21	0.71	0.36	0.33	0.22	0.38	0.04	0.05	0.70	0.72	0.23	0.25	0.12	0.47	0.24	0.18	0.03	5.49
Mississippi	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.89	0.35	0.16	0.32	0.31	0.08	0.16	0.59	0.88	0.38	0.28	0.36	0.47	0.88	0.80	0.00	7.74
U. of Illinois	0.41	0.47	0.37	0.58	0.45	0.32	0.19	0.32	0.08	0.16	0.41	0.57	0.27	0.15	0.12	0.20	0.22	0.05	0.04	5.37
Portage	0.16	0.28	0.15	0.39	0.48	0.16	0.12	0.27	0.09	0.12	0.56	0.46	0.63	0.11	0.58	0.11	0.12	0.19	0.01	4.98
Texas Tech	0.48	0.58	0.31	0.86	0.65	0.86	0.40	0.37	0.26	0.21	0.75	0.59	0.63	0.23	0.34	0.34	0.28	0.06	0.00	8.20
Region VII	0.21	0.12	0.14	0.88	0.39	0.32	0.35	0.58	0.11	0.19	0.76	0.75	0.30	0.21	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.04	0.01	5.94
U. of Denver	0.32	0.51	0.29	0.65	0.64	0.58	0.27	0.60	0.22	0.16	0.60	0.65	0.90	0.17	0.10	0.27	0.46	0.19	0.00	7.55
Los Angeles	0.22	0.26	0.32	0.47	0.41	0.20	0.17	0.38	0.07	0.10	0.48	0.42	0.41	0.11	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.06	0.02	4.60
Pacific**	0.60	0.65	0.04	0.28	0.53	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.54	0.01	4.00
PSU	0.54	0.52	0.45	0.57	0.52	0.43	0.31	0.37	0.34	0.14	0.60	0.45	0.35	0.38	0.37	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.02	6.94
Alaska	0.77	0.85	0.50	0.73	0.85	0.23	0.27	0.65	0.42	0.23	0.54	0.46	0.85	0.23	0.04	0.15	0.77	0.58	0.00	9.12
ALL RAPS:	0.32	0.37	0.31	0.65	0.47	0.29	0.24	0.42	0.13	0.19	0.63	0.60	0.46	0.21	0.20	0.24	0.28	0.17	0.02	6.21

* See the following table for details of specific handicapping conditions cited by the respondents. Proportions based on total of 2767 cases.

**This RAP did all its training in the summer of 1982, before the 1983 RAP Training Conference Evaluation Survey forms were distributed. Consequently, Pacific respondents were not asked in the form itself about such workshop topics as working with the public schools, attitudes toward handicapped children, behavior management, working with gifted/talented children, abuse and neglect of the handicapped child, or working with severely handicapped children. Instead, the 1982 survey forms were used. These included some precoded responses for topics not listed separately in 1983, including "expectations and techniques," a response treated as an "other" in the table, above.

***Other topics mentioned, by RAP:

New England: hospital care, 11 cases; terminally/chronically ill, 8 cases; others, 2 cases.

NYU: separation in young children, 10 cases; non-English-speaking, 4 cases; bilingual and the handicapped, 3 cases; mobility for visually impaired, 3 cases; "New Friends," 3 cases; genetics and the family, 2 cases; miscellaneous others, 8 cases.

Region III: attention deficits, 12 cases; movement and music, 9 cases; perceptual motor problems, 6 cases; developmental delays, 5 cases; interagency collaboration, 4 cases; "New Friends," 4 cases; "warning signs," 4 cases; TEACH manual, 2 cases. One "multiple response" (one case with two separate topics cited).

Chapel Hill: aggression, 8 cases; creative arts, 4 cases; stress/burnout, 3 cases; others, 3 cases. Three multiple response cases.

Nashville: stress, 20 cases; others, 2 cases.(both multiple response--e.g., cited "stress" plus one additional "other" topic).

Mississippi: "New Friends," 128 cases; working with volunteers, 10 cases; role of the teacher, 8 cases; others, 12 cases. 26 multiple responses.

University of Illinois: "adult training," 5 cases; others, 4 cases.

Portage: multiple responses: abusive/difficult parents, 13 cases; language stimulation, 7 cases; self-concepts and self-esteem, 6 cases; "nurturing," 4 cases; "New Friends," 3 cases; others, 2 cases. Total, 35 citations from 24 cases.

Texas Tech: language development, 3 cases; health tracking systems, 3 cases; others, 3 cases; "other" not specified, 2 cases.

Region VII: "New Friends," 6 cases; "making handicapped dolls," 2 cases; other miscellaneous, 7 cases.

University of Denver: "fine motor coordination" or similar responses, 23 cases; behavior management, 4 cases; parent involvement, 3 cases; others and miscellaneous, 8 cases.

Los Angeles: "Community teams," 7 cases; children's literature, 4 cases; others/miscellaneous, 2 cases. (Some cited more than one topic.)

Pacific: "Expectations & Techniques," 48 cases; "curriculum and lesson planning," 3 cases; others/miscellaneous, 1 case.

PSU: stress management, 5 cases; cognitive disorders, 2 cases; dental needs of the handicapped, 2 cases.

AlasPa: child development/motor development, 7 cases; class management, 7 cases; social development, 1 case.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Pacific, which used the 1981-82 versions of the questionnaires and which has a non-comparable service situation as well.

Although the overall propensity to cite workshops dealing with specific handicaps has gone down, there is a rough consistency between the distribution of particular handicapping conditions that the respondents cited and the range of conditions cited by trainees in the past; that is, there continues to be a persistent need for training in most of the major types of handicapping conditions. Overall, those mentioning training on specific handicaps in the RAP conferences cited the following types of conditions (see Table 4.8):

- Learning Disabilities. Twenty-five percent of those citing training in specific handicaps mentioned this type of condition.
- Speech and Language Impairments. Cited by 23 percent of those mentioning training in specific handicaps.
- Deafness and Hearing Impairments. Cited by 21 percent.
- Emotional Disturbances. Cited by 17 percent.
- Health Impairments. Cited by 17 percent.
- Blindness and Visual Impairments. Cited by 16 percent.
- Mental Retardation. Cited by 11 percent.
- Physical Impairments (typically referred to by respondents as orthopedic impairments; see footnote, Table 4.8). Cited by 9 percent.
- No condition specified. Twenty five percent of those indicating that they were trained in specific handicaps did not cite any particular condition.

RAPs exhibit clear distinctions in their offerings of training in these different kinds of handicap:

- At New England the most common handicaps treated in workshops were Deafness/Hearing Impairments and Health Impairments;
- At NYU the most frequently cited handicaps were Health Impairments, "No handicap specified," Deafness, and Emotional Disturbances;

TABLE 4.8: TOPICS CITED, CONTINUED: WORKSHOPS CITED ON SPECIFIC HANDICAPS, BY RAP

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 (100%) due to multiple answers. Warning: in this table, unlike others, proportions are based on the total number of trainees citing any specific handicaps as training topics, and measure the relative propensity for particular disabilities to be those cited. For a measure of the general propensity to report any handicapping condition as a workshop topic, see Table 4.7, column 17. These conventions are consistent with those employed in the RAP evaluation for the 1981-82 program year.)

RAP:	Blind*/ Visually Impaired	Deaf*/ Hearing Impaired	Speech Impaired	Emotionally Disturbed	Physically Impaired	Health Impaired	Learning Disabled	Mentally Retarded	Handicap not Specified	Average No. HCs Cited
New England	0.00	0.50	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.13	1.17
NYU	0.05	0.20	0.02	0.17	0.05	0.32	0.02	0.04	0.26	1,13
Region III	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.11	0.24	0.29	0.03	0.34	1.13
Chapel Hill	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.06	0.37	0.00	0.20	0.54	1.20
Nashville	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.22	0.11	0.19	0.67	1.37
Mississippi	0.01	0.03	0.50	0.41	0.01	0.10	0.67	0.01	0.06	1.80
U. of Illinois	0.22	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.25	0.00	0.17	1.19
Portage	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.40	1.00
Texas Tech	0.04	0.14	0.57	0.02	0.02	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.06	1.22
Region VII	0.28	0.22	0.11	0.02	0.33	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.50	1.52
U. of Denver	0.66	0.65	0.14	0.16	0.20	0.07	0.58	0.49	0.20	3.17
Los Angeles	0.00	0.04	0.30	0.35	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.13	0.35	1.26
Pacific*	0.34	0.43	0.21	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.34	1.77
PSU	0.22	0.22	0.11	0.22	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.11	0.28	1.50
Alaska	0.35	0.40	0.45	0.30	0.35	0.00	0.40	0.40	0.10	2.75
ALL RAPS	0.16	0.21	0.23	0.17	0.09	0.17	0.25	0.11	0.25	1.63

* The Pacific RAP used the 1982 version of the training evaluation survey form. This version listed the specific handicaps that could be treated in workshops; the 1983 forms did not provide a list of check-off boxes, but instead provided space for respondents to name the handicapping topics covered by their workshops. Respondents who used the 1983 version of the questionnaire tended not to cite separate workshops for blind or deaf children; however, workshops for visually impaired or hearing impaired cases continue to be very frequently cited, suggesting that the blind/deaf topics are handled under these broader categories. Accordingly, for the purpose of tabulating workshop topics, these handicapping conditions are paired, as above. Another shift in response patterns that may be related to the change from a precoded list of handicaps to an open-ended treatment of these topics is the propensity to report attendance in workshops on "ortho" HC's, coded here as "physically impaired." A few respondents said they attended workshops on more specific topics like hyperactivity (classed for present purposes with training workshops on the emotionally disturbed) and Down's Syndrome (classed here with workshops on mental retardation).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- At Region III they were "No handicap specified," Learning Disabilities, and Health Impairments;
- At both Chapel Hill and Nashville, they were "No handicap specified," Health Impairments, and Mental Retardation;
- At Mississippi, they were Learning Disabilities, Speech and Language Impairments, and Emotional Disturbances;
- At the University of Illinois a wide range of conditions was mentioned, but none by really substantial numbers of trainees;
- At Portage, the predominant handicap workshops reported by trainees were those on Health Impairments and those for which no particular condition was specified;
- At Texas Tech, the predominant types were Speech and Language Disabilities and Health Impairments;
- At Region VII, the predominant response of those citing training in specific handicaps was, like Chapel Hill and Nashville, "No handicap specified;" Physical Impairment, Blind/Visually Impaired, and Deafness/Hearing Impairments workshops were also cited by a number of trainees;
- At the University of Denver, the most commonly cited topics included Blindness/Visual Impairments, Deafness/Hearing Impairments, Learning Disabilities, and Mental Retardation;
- At LA, a wide range of topics was cited, particularly "No particular handicap," Emotional Disturbances, and Speech and Language Impairments;
- At Pacific, a wide range of topics was cited, particularly Deafness/Hearing Impairments, "No particular handicaps." Blindness/Visual Impairments, and Speech and Language Impairments;
- At PSU, a wide range of conditions was mentioned but none by very many trainees, similar to the University of Illinois; and
- At Alaska, considerable interest was evident in workshops on all of the major handicapping conditions, with the sole exception of Health Impairments.

These data on workshops attended by RAP trainees have been influenced by changes in the ways that the information was solicited in the survey form. In general, however, the results accurately describe RAP training,

and the new list of topics is a fitting classification of the material offered to these trainees.

Changes Resulting From The Training

Previous evaluation surveys asked trainees "what they expected to do differently as a result of the training." In the 1982-83 data, the typical number of expected changes cited by the trainees has gone down, from 4.2 in 1981-82 to 3.4 in 1982-83. Allowing for this moderate reduction in the overall propensity to decide to change practices as a result of RAP training, the distribution of types of changes, presented in Table 4.9, is not unlike that reported in the past. The predominate lesson trainees take away from RAP conferences is still to "Observe more closely" (cited by 68% in 1981-82, 61% this year). Other common responses are also the same as before, "Use new materials or resources" (49% last year, 48% this year), "Use new ways with handicapped children" (53% last year, 45% this year), "Work more closely with other staff" (49% last year, 42% this year). Two items on the 1981-82 forms -- "Plan with parents" and "Relate more with parents," cited last year by 38 and 44 percent of the trainees, respectively, were combined in the revised 1982-83 questionnaires into a single "Work more closely with families" item; it was checked by 40 percent of the trainees. "Plan for each child" was cited by 41 percent last year, 34 percent this year. "Develop IEPs" and "Use Head Start manuals" were each cited by 24 percent of the trainees in 1981-82; this year, 21 percent cited the former type of change, and 31 percent said they expected to make use of the manuals -- the only type of expected change to be more frequently cited this year than in 1981-82 (except for the "others," which also increased). "Changes in record-keeping practices" was a type of change dropped from the list in the survey form this year, but the item was checked frequently (and coded, as an "other") in the older forms used by the Pacific RAP, and was written in as an "other" change by trainees at some other RAPs. In addition, a "no changes expected" response was added to the form, and five percent of the respondents used it.

There are some variations by RAP in the number and nature of expected changes in practices. New England trainees were especially unlikely to anticipate change with either IEP's or the use of manuals. Other RAPs' trainees were also less likely than average to cite changes involving the manuals: Region III, Nashville, Illinois, Denver, PSU, and the Pacific RAP, where only 5 percent cited this type of change. The RAPs where many trainees were looking forward to changes in their use of the manuals are Mississippi (68% of the trainees), Portage (52%), Region VII (44%), Los Angeles (41%), and Texas Tech (38%). Texas Tech is also the only RAP where a majority of trainees said they expected to change their use of IEP's.

NYU's trainees seem a little more likely than those at most RAPs to expect to work more closely with both families of handicapped children and other Head Start staff. Mississippi shows even more of such inclinations; indeed, its trainees are more prone than most to cite

TABLE 4.9: WHAT TRAINEES EXPECT TO DO DIFFERENTLY AFTER THEIR TRAINING, BY RAP

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 due to multiple responses)

	Use New Ways w/ Children	Observe More Closely	Plan For Each Child	Develop IEP,IPP (etc)	Work Closely w: Family	Work Closely w: O/Staff	Use New Mater'l	Use H.S. Manuals	Other Changes **	No Expected Changes	No Answer	Average No. of Changes:
New England	0.46	0.67	0.23	0.06	0.32	0.38	0.61	0.11	0.03	0.09	0.05	3.00
NYU	0.46	0.72	0.25	0.12	0.55	0.54	0.53	0.30	0.04	0.04	0.01	3.57
Region III	0.46	0.64	0.21	0.14	0.28	0.31	0.47	0.16	0.04	0.03	0.03	2.77
Chapel Hill	0.55	0.56	0.36	0.23	0.47	0.46	0.43	0.30	0.05	0.10	0.05	3.57
Nashville	0.61	0.53	0.25	0.18	0.46	0.39	0.39	0.12	0.02	0.04	0.02	3.01
Mississippi	0.80	0.80	0.44	0.22	0.67	0.62	0.62	0.68	0.01	0.00	0.00	4.86
U. of Illinois	0.36	0.55	0.28	0.19	0.27	0.30	0.39	0.14	0.02	0.12	0.05	2.68
Portage	0.06	0.32	0.50	0.27	0.09	0.30	0.27	0.52	0.07	0.09	0.03	2.52
Texas Tech	0.62	0.67	0.42	0.58	0.47	0.44	0.57	0.38	0.04	0.05	0.01	4.24
Region VII	0.51	0.53	0.24	0.16	0.49	0.43	0.54	0.44	0.03	0.07	0.02	3.46
U. of Denver	0.56	0.72	0.33	0.24	0.43	0.38	0.50	0.18	0.04	0.01	0.05	3.44
Los Angeles	0.09	0.49	0.58	0.25	0.10	0.33	0.32	0.41	0.11	0.04	0.03	2.74
Pacific*	0.38	0.68	0.64	0.27	0.31	0.28	0.52	0.05	0.52	0.00	0.03	3.67
PSU	0.37	0.43	0.14	0.25	0.29	0.42	0.48	0.14	0.09	0.05	0.08	2.72
Alaska	0.58	0.73	0.46	0.15	0.27	0.35	0.62	0.31	0.00	0.08	0.00	3.54
ALL RAPS:	0.45	0.61	0.34	0.21	0.40	0.42	0.48	0.31	0.06	0.05	0.03	3.35

* The 1982 survey forms used by the Pacific RAP did not include a specific response for the answer "No expected changes." They did include other precoded answers such as "Expectations & Techniques," coded here as "Other."

**"Other" expected changes cited by respondents were, by RAP:

New England: 3 miscellaneous (all different): "improve communication techniques," reevaluate thinking on hearing impairments," "Ask to purchase an MD-1."

NYU: incorporate material into work, 2 cases; share info with other staff, 2 cases; "first week on the job, can't really 'change' yet," one case; 12 others, all different/miscellaneous; four unspecified

Region III: nine miscellaneous responses: "be more aware of how my reactions, attitudes, etc., affect my work," "change some of my discipline methods," "have new ideas for use in classroom," etc.

Chapel Hill: three miscellaneous: "share info/handouts," "help teachers/aides make new materials," etc.; four "others" did not specify what they had in mind

Nashville: "more staff education," "use handicapped dolls and introduce HC unit."

Mississippi: "involve staff and parents in making dolls..." (one "other" response).

University of Illinois: "more exchange of ideas, activities/materials to take home," "plan in-service training differently," "planning adult training and follow-up" (three misc.)

Portage: "Be more aware," 3 cases; other responses, 8 cases.

Texas Tech: Use PIR forms, 2 cases; five mixed/misc. responses ("be more patient," "coordinate with agencies," etc.)

Region VII: attitudinal changes, 2 cases; use of dolls, 2 cases; other responses, 8 cases.

University of Denver: more or revised training of local staff, 3 cases; other responses, 4 cases.

Los Angeles: "Work more with community," 3 cases; other responses, 8 cases.

Pacific: "Keep better records on children," 48 cases; other responses, 2 cases.

PSU: new ways to deal with parents/families, 3 cases; other responses, 3 cases.

Alaska: inapplicable; no trainees cited "other" expected changes.

virtually all of the various types of possible changes suggested by the form, and they name more kinds of changes, on the average, than the trainees from other RAPs. Texas Tech's trainees are similar; they also cite more expected changes than most.

RAPs where trainees were prone to cite smaller numbers of expected changes include Portage, Illinois, PSU, LA, and Region III. The Portage and LA RAPs' trainees are especially unlikely to cite the change "Use new ways with handicapped children." Trainees at these two RAPs are also less likely than most to expect to "Work more closely with families." It should be noted that we attach no value judgment to this result; the trainees may be telling us, in effect, that they already work closely with families, for example. The RAP-by-RAP distinctions here are useful more as descriptive data, not as material bearing on impact.

Verifying The Expected Changes in Practices: The Long-Term Follow-Up

As has been done in previous evaluations of the RAP training, a small sample (30) of the trainees was selected and called to follow up on actual outcomes associated with the changes the trainees had expected in their practices. The 30 cases (listed by RAP in Table 4.3) draw from all RAPs save NYU, inadvertently omitted due to a sampling error.

Table 4.10 provides some comparative data on the 30-case subsample and the main set of 2,767 trainees which provided the data presented in prior sections of this analysis. The similarity in proportions of teaching staff and in the particular satisfaction ratings of the trainees is by design: the cases were stratified according to these criteria and subsample respondents were selected randomly within each cluster. Non-Head Start staff were excluded. Analysis is restricted to the overall program; the number of cases per RAP is much too small to draw reliable inferences at that level. The "additional variables" in Table 4.10 show that while the small sample mirrors the full evaluation data base rather closely in the share of its members who work directly with handicapped children, the follow-up cases are more likely than most to include people who work indirectly with these children (and less likely to include those who don't work with them at all). The follow-up cases are also more likely than most to have attended RAP training before, and they expected more different types of changes than the typical respondent in the main survey, on the average.

The outcome of the validation study is much the same as that reported for prior evaluations of RAP training. The sample of 30 trainees originally cited a total of 110 expected changes in their practices. Each telephone interview included a review of these expectations. Of the 110 anticipated changes, respondents said, at least three months later, they had actually experienced 99; the other 11 expected changes either had not occurred by the time the follow-up interviews took place, or were no longer expected to occur at all. However, the respondents also cited 15 additional, unexpected changes in their work which they attributed to the training, more than making up this difference. This includes two

Table 4.10

COMPARISON OF LONG-TERM AND SHORT-TERM SAMPLES*

Item:	SHORT TERM: (2,767 Written Responses)	LONG TERM: (30 Telephone Interviews)
Subsample Selection Criteria:		
Background		
HS Teaching Staff	64%	60%
Other HS Staff	33	40
Satisfaction		
Excellent	55%	50%
Good	41	47
Fair or Poor	3	3
Additional Items (see comments in text):		
Work With Handicapped?		
Yes, Directly	59%	60%
Yes, Indirectly	20	37
No	16	3
Prior RAP Mainstreaming Training Participation?		
Yes	46%	70%
No	46	30
Expected Number of Changes in Practices	3.35	3.67

Note: * Percentages may not total exactly 100.0% due to rounding and omission of cases that did not respond to items.

unanticipated effects of the training for one respondent who had not expected to make any changes at all.

In summary, the proportion of anticipated changes linked by respondents to RAP training which actually were experienced by these participants was very high — 90 percent -- and newly discovered effects more than compensated for those expectations that were not fulfilled. As in previous studies of the training, we conclude that the trainees' expectations as to the impact of their training experience appear to be a fairly accurate predictor of the assessments the same trainees offer in retrospect, some months later.

These follow-up cases were also asked a single broad retrospective question: "Did the training meet your needs?" Twenty-eight of the 30 cases -- 93 percent -- said that it had met their needs. One respondent said her needs had not been met, and one said her needs had not been met but that this had nothing to do with the quality or nature of the training. Again, virtually the same results were obtained for the comparable item in the 1981-82 evaluation.

What Trainees Liked Best

A new item was added to the revised 1982-83 training evaluation questionnaires, providing open-ended space for respondents to write in what they liked best about the training conference they attended. Like the comments that accompany many of the ratings of overall satisfaction with the training, those responses have been sorted, listed, and sent to each RAP as feedback for future planning. The following is a selection of these responses for each of the RAPs, choosing the more common comments:

- New England: "Presenters well versed, experienced, enthusiastic, informative..." "Liked films, handouts..."

- NYU: "All the training -- everything..." "Group participation, discussions, dynamics..." "Information given for working with children and families..." "Sharing experiences, ideas, techniques..." "Very well organized; began on time, ended on time..."

- Region III: "Group discussions and involvement..." "Information, not chatter..." "New ideas..." "The speakers were excellent..."

- Chapel Hill: "All very helpful to me..." "Language stimulation training..." "The relaxed way the sessions were presented..."

- Nashville: "Liked all of it..." "Managing stress - a terrific workshop..." "Presented very well, non-threatening, sincere..."

- Mississippi: "How to work with handicapped children..." "Making/using the 'New Friends' dolls..."

- University of Illinois: "The films; Krista ..." "Very informative, thorough..." "The 'New Friends' session; the dolls..."

- Portage: "Self-concept workshop was stimulating and uplifting..." "New ideas for teaching..." "The trainers were interesting; lots of participation..."

- Texas Tech: "All sessions were good..." "Behavior management (workshop)..." "Information on IEP's..." "Very competent trainers..."

- Region VII: "All of it was good..." "The film Krista and the dolls..." "Interesting...not boring...enjoyable..." "Smaller groups..."

- University of Denver: "Actual hands-on activities..." "Informative, pleasant, well presented..." "The handouts, visual aids, preparedness of the presenters..."

- Los Angeles: "Everything was good..." "The parent panel -- I liked the personal views..." "Speakers were very good..."

- Pacific: this RAP used the 1981-82 versions of the survey form for trainees, so that the "new items" question was not asked.

- PSU: "All the training was interesting and helpful..." "Stress management (workshop)..."

- Alaska: "Lots of good new information....instructors were wonderful."

In addition, the number of trainees declining to choose a "best-liked" aspect of the training was calculated for each RAP. Overall, 758 of the 2,670 applicable cases - Pacific is excluded - did not supply any response to the item. This amounts to 28 percent of the trainees. The equivalent percentage was between 23 and 34 percent for all of the RAPs but three. Only five percent of the Mississippi trainees did not cite a "best-liked" feature of the training. At Los Angeles and Illinois, 40 and 42 percent of the respondents, respectively, declined to cite such features.

"Unexpected Condition" and Other Problems

In past years a single item was used in the training evaluation to inquire into problems. In the revision of the survey for the 1982-83 research, this was split into two questions, one designed to deal with

TABLE 4.11: UNEXPECTED CONDITIONS THAT AFFECTED THE TRAINING CONFERENCES, BY RAP

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 (100%) due to multiple answers)

RAP:	No Unexpected Conditions:	Yes: unexpected conditions include: Limited Space	Equipment Not Working	Poor Facility	Room Temperature	Bad Weather	Other** Circumstances	Average Number of Conditions Cited:*	Proportion Citing Any Condition	No Response to Item
New England	0.37	0.07	0.00	0.04	0.51	0.00	0.10	0.74	0.62	0.03
NYU	0.48	0.08	0.00	0.04	0.21	0.24	0.09	0.71	0.49	0.07
Region III	0.63	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.08	0.23	0.04	0.40	0.36	0.02
Chapel Hill	0.75	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.15	0.00	0.03	0.23	0.20	0.06
Nashville	0.83	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.16	0.14	0.03
Mississippi	0.75	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.01	0.20	0.18	0.08
U. of Illinois	0.52	0.14	0.01	0.02	0.28	0.00	0.04	0.53	0.44	0.07
Portage	0.58	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.27	0.00	0.06	0.49	0.40	0.03
Texas Tech	0.65	0.08	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.14	0.05	0.51	0.32	0.05
Region VII	0.57	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.22	0.07	0.03	0.43	0.36	0.10
U. of Denver	0.70	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.17	0.01	0.07	0.30	0.27	0.04
Los Angeles	0.82	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.04	0.16	0.12	0.07
Pacific*	0.70	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.25	0.38	0.28	0.03
PSU	0.43	0.22	0.08	0.09	0.17	0.02	0.09	0.73	0.53	0.09
Alaska	0.62	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.04	0.46	0.33	0.08
ALL RAPS	0.62	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.17	0.09	0.06	0.44	0.34	0.06

* The Pacific RAP used the 1982 version of the training evaluation survey form. This version did not include the separate item on unexpected conditions; responses were coded from a broader item that combines these "conference condition" problems with the more RAP-related training problems covered in the next table. The average number of reported conditions is less than one because most trainees said there were no conditions of these kinds affecting their training.

**"Other" conditions affecting the training conferences and reported by trainees included (by RAP):

New England: not enough food, 7 cases; line for lunch, 1 case; changes in agenda, 1 case; unspecified, two.

NYU: smoking, too much smoke, 15 cases; poor ventilation/noisy fans, 5 cases; couldn't hear/insufficient amplification, 2 cases; breakfast too expensive/dining room much too slow/rooms too small/hotel unprepared, etc., etc., 10 cases; not enough time, 3 cases; no notification of changes, 3 cases; people coming in late/started late, 2 cases; too large, 1 case; stayed at different hotel, 1 case.

Region III: poor lighting, 2 cases; not enough time, 2 cases; miscellaneous comments--"lecturer spoke too softly," "original workshop cancelled," "wrong directions," "serving coffee or tea" (?)--four cases; one unspecified

Chapel Hill: smoking, 2 cases; trainer late, 1 case; some sessions too long, 1 case.

Nashville: two different locations, 2 cases; 3 mixed/miscellaneous--"too much smoke," "lateness of closing," "stress" (?)--and 2 unspecified.

Mississippi: not enough time, 1 case; session too long, 1 case.

University of Illinois: poor directions, 2 cases; not enough time for workshops, 2 cases; prefer downtown location, 2 cases.

Portage: few breaks/long sessions, 4 cases; smoking, 3 cases; other comments, 2 cases (multiple responses).

Texas Tech: smoking, 2 cases; too far to come, 2 cases; no tables, 2 cases; not enough time, 2 cases; unspecified, 2 cases.

Region VII: not enough time in sessions, 4 cases; smoking permitted, 2 cases; others, 4 cases.

University of Denver: not long enough, needed more time, 5 cases; smoking, 5 cases; others, 2 cases.

Los Angeles: not enough time, 4 cases; other responses, 6 cases.

Pacific: needed more time, 21 cases; other responses, 3 cases.

PSU: not enough handouts, 2 cases; not enough time, 2 cases; other responses, 2 cases.

Alaska: one miscellaneous response.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

problems of space, facilities and equipment, etc., and the other intended for problems with training content and presentation. Thus this year's responses are not precisely comparable to those obained in the past.

Table 4.11 provides the data for the "unexpected conditions." Overall, 34 percent of the respondents had one or more of these difficulties to report. Trainees at Nashville and LA were especially unlikely to cite these problems of facilities and other circumstantial difficulties; those at the New England and Portland conferences were especially prone to report them. The most common condition reported turns out to be room temperature; 17 percent of the trainees complained about this, and it was the predominant irritating condition for the New England trainees. Inclement weather affected conferences held by NYU, Region III, and (to a lesser extent) Texas Tech, Mississippi and Region VII. Portland trainees reported a lack of sufficient space; to a lesser extent, so did those at the University of Illinois' meetings. The "other" conditions reported are also of interest. It would appear from those comments that NYU had an unfortunate choice of a conference site, and that at nearly every RAP some trainees are bothered by smoking at the conferences. As in the past, many respondents also say that there isn't enough time in these meetings to cover all the material.

The reported training problems are summarized in Table 4.12. Twelve percent of the respondents cited these problems — not a large proportion, overall, but at some RAPs this percentage rose significantly. Portland's trainees were the most likely (42%) to cite problems of training content or delivery; the major complaint was that the level of presentation was too simple. Twenty-six percent of the Illinois trainees cited training problems; their major complaints were that the training wasn't what they had expected (the cancellation of a popular workshop may have been a factor here). Trainees at Mississippi, Denver, Region VII, Pacific, Nashville, and Region III were somewhat less likely than most to cite problems.

Suggestions for Next Year

Invited to make suggestions for future RAP training, over 90 percent of the trainees in the survey did so. The major perceived needs are for more training in abuse and neglect of handicapped children, in behavior management, and in working with families of handicapped children; each of these was cited by 41-42 percent of the trainees. Supervisory training, more work on IEP's, training on the needs of severely handicapped children, and training on work with public schools was endorsed by 29-22 percent of the trainees. Other suggestions were mentioned only by comparatively small numbers of respondents (see Table 4.13).

Summary

In last year's evaluation of RAP training, we noted that the continued drop in reported training problems (which seems to have been preserved this year, although the shift to using two separate questions hinders

TABLE 4.12: OTHER PROBLEMS THAT AFFECTED THE TRAINING CONFERENCES, BY RAP

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 (100%) due to multiple answers)

RAP:	No Problems:	Yes: problems include:						Average Number of Problems Cited:*	Proportion Citing Any Problem	No Response to Item
		Poorly Planned	Too General	Content Too Simple	Content Too Difficult	Not What Trainee Expected	Other Problem **			
New England	0.79	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.19	0.15	0.08
NYU	0.76	0.00	0.08	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.24	0.18	0.07
Region III	0.88	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.05
Chapel Hill	0.86	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.05
Nashville	0.89	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.04
Mississippi	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.08
U. of Illinois	0.67	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.09	0.31	0.26	0.09
Portage	0.74	0.01	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.33	0.20	0.07
Texas Tech	0.82	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.15	0.12	0.07
Region VII	0.83	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.12
U. of Denver	0.90	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.06
Los Angeles	0.85	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.06
Pacific*	0.91	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.06	0.03
PSU	0.57	0.02	0.05	0.18	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.48	0.42	0.02
Alaska	0.85	0.12	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.15	0.00
ALL RAPS	0.82	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.15	0.12	0.07

* The Pacific RAP used the 1982 version of the training evaluation survey form. This version did not include the separate item on unexpected conditions; responses were coded from a broader item that combines those "conference condition" problems with the more RAP-related training problems covered in this table. The average number of reported problems is less than one because most trainees said there were no problems of these kinds affecting their training.

**"Other" problems reported by trainees include, by RAP:

New England: 6 miscellaneous: too much being read to/workshops too long/lecturer uninterested/substitute not prepared/no hands-on activities/more discussion

NYU: boring speakers/trainers, repetitious, long sessions, need small groups: 8 cases; initial session dull/too long, 4 cases; no print info, overload of info, other miscellaneous comments, 11 cases

Region III: seven miscellaneous: trainers/not enough time/too repetitive/not presented well/moved along too slowly/others

Chapel Hill: not enough time, 3 cases; three miscellaneous

Nashville: too long, 1 case; not enough time, 1 case.

Mississippi: Inapplicable--no "other" responses.

University of Illinois: language workshop closed/best workshop cancelled, 2 cases; too long/too much repetition, 6 cases; seven others (disappointed with changes/talked too low/only got to go to one session/prefer hands-on help/others)

Portage: few or no breaks, 4 cases; other responses, 6 cases.

Texas Tech: HI session poor, 2 cases; five miscellaneous: session incorrect, unprofessional/more dynamic speakers/not enough materials/not enough notification/too far to come

Region VII: miscellaneous--no two responses alike: 7 cases.

University of Denver: one miscellaneous response.

Los Angeles: 7 miscellaneous comments plus one unspecified "other."

Pacific: one miscellaneous response.

PSU: late start/confused registration, 3 cases; others, 6 cases.

Alaska: not applicable; no trainees cited "other" conditions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4.13: SUGGESTIONS FROM CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS FOR NEXT YEAR'S RAP TRAINING

(Note: proportions--e.g., .73--times 100 equal percents, i.e., 73%. Totals exceed 1.0 due to multiple responses)

RAP:	Proportions suggesting training in such topics as: IEP's, IPP's, etc.	Behavior Management	Working w/Public Schools	Child Abuse/ Neglect	Working w/severe HCs	Working w/families	Supervisor's Training	Other Suggestions*	No Answer	Average Number of Suggestions
New England	0.27	0.39	0.29	0.46	0.18	0.45	0.37	0.04	0.07	2.51
NYU	0.26	0.38	0.32	0.50	0.23	0.43	0.33	0.07	0.06	2.58
Region III	0.27	0.36	0.23	0.47	0.14	0.26	0.24	0.09	0.08	2.13
Chapel Hill	0.24	0.48	0.19	0.46	0.29	0.40	0.40	0.04	0.11	2.61
Nashville	0.32	0.59	0.16	0.33	0.32	0.45	0.25	0.05	0.07	2.54
Mississippi	0.35	0.47	0.19	0.46	0.40	0.51	0.31	0.02	0.04	2.74
U. of Illinois	0.27	0.45	0.24	0.36	0.21	0.42	0.32	0.08	0.12	2.46
Portage	0.17	0.41	0.30	0.38	0.18	0.35	0.30	0.12	0.14	2.34
Texas Tech	0.30	0.46	0.24	0.50	0.41	0.39	0.30	0.05	0.08	2.73
Region VII	0.21	0.43	0.15	0.33	0.22	0.43	0.22	0.02	0.13	2.14
U. of Denver	0.15	0.36	0.24	0.52	0.28	0.44	0.30	0.08	0.09	2.47
Los Angeles	0.18	0.44	0.15	0.46	0.18	0.35	0.32	0.05	0.10	2.24
Pacific**	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.22	0.53	0.14	1.63
PSU	0.20	0.42	0.25	0.25	0.14	0.43	0.25	0.15	0.06	2.14
Alaska	0.35	0.54	0.23	0.31	0.19	0.46	0.23	0.04	0.12	2.46
ALL RAPS:	0.24	0.41	0.22	0.42	0.23	0.41	0.29	0.08	0.09	2.39

* "Other" suggestions made by trainees include, by RAP:

New England: five miscellaneous: communicating with persons unfamiliar with HC/health related issues/ validity & reliability of screening tests/withdrawn children/working with siblings of HC

NYU: 37 varied responses--see listing

Region III: TEACH, 3 cases; LD, 2 cases; 16 others plus one not specified

Chapel Hill: six others: cultural diversity and bilingualism/developing positive attitudes in staff/ labeling/play techniques/public awareness of the handicapped

Nashville: six others: diagnosis/,managing stress/new rules & regulations pertaining to the handicapped/ training for all HS staff/visit agencies for children with special needs for observation

Mississippi: phonetics, 3 cases; making dolls from scratch, 1 case

Illinois: Speech and language workshop (HR: Cf. this note for prior table), 5 cases; six others, 2 unsp

Portage: 15 miscellaneous responses (each a different comment).

Texas Tech: Classroom activities/ideas, 2 cases; others, one mention each: documentation/HC survey form /HomeStart/Observations and documentation/screening for HC's and specific ways to teach HC/ specific HC conditions/training for parents

Region VII: more training on deaf/hearing impaired, 2 cases; others/miscellaneous, 5 cases.

University of Denver: more on learning disabilities, 2 cases; others/miscellaneous, 13 cases.

Los Angeles: identification of the handicapped, 3 cases; other responses, 11 cases.

Pacific: training on screening/assessment/diagnosis, 24 cases; on handicaps in general, 19 cases; on specific handicapping conditions, 4 cases; others/miscellaneous, 4 cases.

PSU: more on speech/hearing, 2 cases; others/miscellany, 8 cases.

Alaska: one miscellaneous response.

**This RAP did all its training in the summer of 1982, before the 1983 RAP Training Conference Evaluation Survey forms were distributed. Consequently Pacific respondents were not asked in the form itself about preferences for training in behavior management, working with public schools, child abuse and neglect, or working with severely handicapped children. Instead, the 1982 survey forms were used. These included some precoded responses for topics not listed separately in 1983, including "screening," "assessment," and "diagnosis." Such responses are counted as "others" in the table, above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

precise comparisons) suggested that the RAPs had "mastered" the training task, incorporating it fully into their set of resources and services. This year's data reinforces that conclusion:

- There has been another substantial gain in the sheer scale of RAP training. For the second year in a row, the total number of trainees increased by well over 2,000 people.

- RAP training reached 87 percent of all Head Start grantees and 31 percent of all Head Start teaching staff. Both figures are increases, albeit small ones, from 1981-82.

- Overall satisfaction with RAP training, already strongly favorable in 1981-82, increased slightly in 1982-83.

- Trainees expect slightly fewer practices to change as a result of RAP training than in the past, but even so, over three specific expected changes in practices were cited by each trainee, on the average, and follow-up surveys confirm that these expectations are realistic ones.

FACILITATING COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS

Collaboration is a major focus of the RAP network, required by contract and underscored by guidance from the national ACYF office. RAPs are obligated by contract to serve as facilitators in promoting formal written agreements between State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Head Start. If such an agreement exists, the RAP's role is extended to facilitate agreements between Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Head Starts. Beyond their work with state and local public school systems, RAPs cooperate with other agencies to cultivate community resources for handicapped children and their families within the community.

SEA/Head Start Collaboration

Under Public Law 94-142, the federal government requires school systems to provide an appropriate education in the least restrictive environment to children with handicapping conditons. At the state level, services to pre-schoolers are mandatory or permissive, depending on specific state legislation.

Among states with mandatory legislation, appropriate services must be available to handicapped pre-schoolers if they are made available to children without handicaps. In states which are not legislatively obligated to serve pre-school children, it is left to the discretion of school systems whether services will be provided.

From the time this task became formalized in 1978, RAPs have assessed the legal and political contexts in which they work, found common ground with SEAs where possible, and demonstrated a willingness to invest their resources in the collaborative process. Where state legislation or SEA resistance or reorganization have stalled efforts to draft or sign an agreement, RAPs have usually found ways to maintain contact until climates were more conducive to collaboration.

Currently 36 agreements exist. Table 5.1 Existing SEA Head Start Agreements as Reported by RAPs, 1983, lists the agreements in each region and the signing parties. The reader is also referred to Table 5.2 for an outline of the contents of these agreements. Although content areas are not inclusive, the key points of each agreement are listed.

Six state-level agreements were newly reported this year, for Mississippi, Michigan, Truk, the Marshall Islands, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. In the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, the NYU RAP found that agreements had existed since 1981 and 1980, respectively. An agreement in Oregon reported in previous years expired this year. Co-signers of each new agreement and their major points are summarized in Table 5.3.

FILMED FROM
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5.1

Existing SEA/Head Start Agreements As Reported By AAP., 1981

		Title of Agreement	Signing Parties
Region I	CT	Interagency Agreement between the Connecticut Department of Education and Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Commissioner, Department of Education ACYF[1]
	MA	Interagency Agreement between the Massachusetts Department of Education and the Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Commissioner, Department of Education ACYF
Region II	NJ	Agreement for Services 1980-1981	Issued by the Interdepartment Committee for Education to the Handicapped
	NY	Memorandum of Mutual Understanding	Executive Deputy Commissioner, State Education Department ACYF
	PR	Cooperative Interagency Agreement for the Delivery of Services to Handicapped Children	Department of Social Services Department of Labor Department of Services Against Addiction Department of Housing Department of Public Education
	VI	Interagency Agreement	Commissioner of Education Virgin Islands Community Action Agency
Region III	DE	Statement of Agreement of Collaboration between Delaware Head Start Programs and the Delaware Department of Public Instruction, Exceptional Children/Special Programs Divisions	State Director, Exceptional Children/Special Programs ACYF
	MD	Signed Statement of Intent	Liaison, State Department of Education Head Start Training Officer
Region IV	FL	An Agreement between the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Education on Behalf of Handicapped Children in Head Start Programs	Commissioner, Department of Education Secretary, Department of Community Affairs
	NC	Cooperative Agreement between North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction/Division for Exceptional Children and Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
	KY	Joint Memorandum of Agreement Between Kentucky Department of Education and Kentucky Head Start Network (Represented by and under Region IV ACYF)	Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education ACYF
	MS	Agreement Between Mississippi State Department of Education and Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Region IV	Mississippi State Superintendent of Education ACYF
Region V	IL	Memorandum re Current Relationship between Public Schools and Head Start Programs in The Delivery of Comprehensive Services to Three through Five Year Old Children with Handicaps (Updated 8/81)	State Superintendent of Education Chairperson, Illinois Association of Head Start Directors
	OH	Memorandum of Agreement between Ohio Division of Special Education and Ohio Head Start Handicap Services Advocate (Updated 12/80)	Director, Division of Special Education Ohio Head Start Handicap Services Advocate
	MN	Joint Statement of Policy between the Minnesota State Department of Education and Head Start Programs in Minnesota	Commissioner of Education ACYF
	MI	Joint Statement of Agreement between Special Education Services Area of the Michigan Department of Education and Region V ACYF and Michigan Head Start Association	Director, Special Education, Department of Education ACYF MI Head Start Association
	WI	Joint Statement of Agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and Head Start in Wisconsin	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
Region VI	LA	An Agreement Concerning the Implementation of Act 754 of Louisiana Legislature of 1977	Superintendent, State Department of Education ACYF
	OK	Letter of Agreement between the Special Education Section Oklahoma State Department of Education and the Oklahoma Head Start Programs	State Superintendent of Public Instruction Director, Division of Economic Opportunity Director, Head Start T/TA
	AR	No signed agreement, but Head Start applies to SEA for funds generated through participation in Child Count, and receives funds directly	

[1] ACYF connotes a signature by the ACYF Regional Program Director or Acting Director

Table 5.1- Cont

		Title of Agreement	Signing Parties
Region VII	KS	Head Start-Kansas State Department of Education Cooperative Agreement	Commissioner, State Department of Education ACYF
	NB	Head Start-Nebraska Department of Education Cooperative Agreement	Nebraska Education Agency ACYF
Region VIII	ND	Collaborative Agreement between the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction/Special Education and Region VIII, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Department of Public Instruction ACYF
	SD	Cooperative Agreement between the Section for Special Education (SEA) and Region VIII Administration for Children, Youth and Families	Director of Special Education ACYF
	UT	Utah State Office of Education/ Regional Head Start Cooperative Agreement	State Superintendent ACYF
Region IX	AZ	Arizona HS grantees have contracted with the Arizona Department of Education for Part B-EHA LEA Entitlement Funds.	
	CA	Interagency Agreement between the State Department of Education/Office of Special Education and the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Region IX, Head Start, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	State Department of Education ACY
	HA	Agreement between the Department of Education, State of Hawaii and Head Start Programs in Hawaii	Superintendent, Department of Education Directors, Hawaii Head Start Grantees
	Palau	Interagency Agreement between the Government of Palau Health Services, Education/Special Education Department and the Head Start for the Provision of Health Services and Education Services	Health Services Education Department Palau Community Action Agency
	Federated States of Micronesia Ponape	Interagency Agreement	Ponape Special Education Coordinator Vocational Education Supervisor Vocational Rehabilitation Coordinator Ponape Head Start Coordinator
	Federated States of Micronesia Yap	Handicapped Children, Youth and Adult Inter-Agency Agreement	Director, Department of Education Special Education Coordinator Acting Director, Health Services Public Health Officer Yap Head Start Director
	Guam	Memorandum of Agreement	Division of Special Education Head Start
	Truk	Memorandum of Agreement Among Agencies, Department of Health, Department of Education and Head Start of Truk	Department of Education Department of Health Services Head Start of Truk
	Marshall Islands	Interagency Agreement between Vocational Rehabilitation, Vocational Education, Head Start Program, Special Education, Public Health	Special Education Vocational Rehabilitation Vocational Education Head Start Health Services
Region X	ID	Interagency Agreement between the Idaho Department of Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region X, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	State Superintendent of Public Instruction ACYF
	WA	Interagency Agreement between the State of Washington, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region X, Administration for Children, Youth and Families	State Superintendent of Public Instruction ACYF

FILMED FROM
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5.2

Abbreviated Contents of SEA/Head Start Collaborative Agreements

	STATES																										U.S. TERRITORIES							
	AZ	AR[4]	CA	CT	DE	FL	HI	ID	IL	KS	KY	LA	MD[4]	MA	MI	MN	MS	NE	NJ	NY	NC	ND	OH	OK	SD	UT	WA	WI	GU	MIs	PAL	PON	PR	TRU	VI	YAP
Signers of Agreements[1]																																				
ACYF	NA	NA	x	x	x			x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	NA	x	x	x			x	x	x	x								
HS						x	x		x						x														x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Other Agencies																														x	x	x	x	x		x
HS Contractor													x										x	x												
Facilitators[2]																																				
RAP	x		x	x	x		x			x		x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x
Other		*				x		x*	x*		x*		x		x*				x				x*	x*				x*					x		x	
Key Points of Agreements[3]																																				
Identification			x		x	x		x	x		x	x				x		x	x	x	x		x	x			x		x				x		x	
Child Count/Child Find	x		x		x	x	x	x	x		x			x		x	x			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x							
Screening			x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x			x	x		x				x	x				x	x	x	x	x
Assessment			x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x				x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Diagnosis			x				x	x	x	x		x		x					x				x	x	x		x				x		x	x	x	x
Referral			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						x	x		x	x				x	x			x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Placement			x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x		x		x				x				x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
Dual Enrollment			x		x	x			x							x																				
Direct Services			x	x			x		x	x						x			x						x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
IEPs			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
Transition Planning			x			x	x		x	x		x				x	x		x	x	x	x				x	x	x								
Information/Data Sharing						x	x		x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x			x			x			
Shared T/TA			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	
Training on Collaboration				x					x	x						x		x			x						x							x		
Transportation									x							x												x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Equipment/Material Sharing						x				x										x		x	x											x	x	x
Encourage LEA/HS Agree'mnts				x		x			x		x	x		x	x	x				x	x	x			x	x	x	x		x					
HS gets $ thru SEA	x	x				x		x						x						x	x	x				x	x								
Identifies RAP							x	x		x							x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x									
Renegotiate/Review Annually			x	x						x		x				x		x		x		x						x								

1.SEA is a signer of all agreements, = Director of Special Ed., etc.; ACYF=Reg'l office program director or acting director; HS=HS grantees; Other depts.= Health, Voc. Ed., Social Services, etc.; HS Contractor=STO, T/TA provider, state HC advocate, etc.; NA=not formal signed agreements, e.g., HS included in a memo, state plan or legislation; 2. Other=HC Advocate, STO, SFC, etc.; *=RAP assisted; 3. Contents not inclusive; 4. Contents of agreements not available.

Table 5.3

Key Points of New SEA/Head Start Agreements in 1982-83

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
Mississippi	Department of Education ACYF/Region IV	• LEA and Head Start personnel should develop procedures for a smooth transition for handicapped children from Head Start to the district program. • Head Start programs will be contacted twice a year by Child Find to remind them that district personnel are looking for handicapped children. Head Starts will refer children who leave their programs to the appropriate local school district. • Programs are encouraged to investigate further ways to collaborate and to share training opportunities. • RAP and the SEA will share statistical data, policies, and regulations with each other.
Michigan	Department of Education ACYF/Region V	• Special Education Services area and Head Start agree to explore areas of collaboration in serving handicapped preschool children. • Local grantees and LEAs are encouraged to explore ways to coordinate services.
	Michigan's Head Start Directors' Association	• Ways to promote an integrated plan will be explored for the individual preprimary handicapped child referred to or enrolled in Head Start and special education. • Special education and Head Start are encouraged to share training and technical assistance opportunities. • Signing parties shall disseminate a mission statement and goals and objectives for special education and Head Starts cooperation.

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
Marshall Islands	Department of Special Education Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Department of Vocational Education Department of Public Health Head Start Program	• To reduce duplication of services, signing parties will share program services, referral, and assessment procedures whenever possible. • Together, the signing parties will develop a comprehensive list of programs and services available or potentially available to handicapped and disabled individuals and will disseminate this information. • All parties will facilitate the development of specific agreements between departments and agencies when the need arises.
Virgin Islands	Department of Education Virgin Islands Community Action Agency	• Department of Education will provide - technical assistance and training to Head Start to facilitate mainstreaming - special education teachers - a screening mechanism and training for Head Start to implement the screening - a mechanism for diagnostic evaluations • Community Action Agency will provide - appropriate space adjacent to Head Start centers for classes for handicapped children - paraprofessionals to work in classrooms for the handicapped - transportation in conjunction with the Department of Education and private sources

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
Truk	Department of Education Department of Health Services Truk Head Start	• Department of Education will provide - education/training and assessment services - IEP development and coordination with Head Start - delivery of services as indicated in the IEP • Department of Health will provide - health screenings - diagnostic evaluation for heaing, vision, and other health impairments - medical and dental treatment services as needed - referral of diagnosed children to special education services for approprite placement • Head Start will provide - an individualized educational program for each handicapped child placed in its setting - personnel to assist in screening and assessing children entering Head Start - transportation of Public Health staff to the off-island centers and of children who need hospital treatment

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
Puerto Rico	Department of Health Department of Social Services Department of Labor-Head Start Department of Services Against Addiction Department of Housing Department of Education	• Department of Education will - locate and evaluate the handicapped population between birth through 21 in coordination with co-signing agencies; offer preliminary screening, medical, social, and educational evaluations and any other type of evaluation if needed. - provide educational services to the handicapped population between 5 through 21 • Department of Labor-Head Start will - refer handicapped children between 0 to 21 to the educational agency - carry out the initial screenings - offer services to handicapped children between 4 and 5 according to the program's eligibility requisites. • Department of Health will - refer handicapped children between 0 and 21 to the Department of Education - carry out the initial health screening of children referred from other sources - carry out the medical evaluation of children who are in the process of being evaluated for placement and educational services. • Department of Social Services will refer children who may be handicapped and who are being served by social service programs to the educational agency.

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
Puerto Rico (cont)		• Department of Services Against Addiction will - refer handicapped children to the Department of Education - carry out the initial screening for referral through the treatment centers • Department of Housing will - disseminate informative materials to its clients - collaborate with the agreement's participating agencies for the provision of physical facilities

RAPs are also helping to update or revise agreements in Massachusetts, North Carolina, Illinois, and North Dakota. The SEA and the RAP in Oregon have been meeting to specify details to be included in a new agreement, following the expiration in June 1983 of the earlier SEA/Head Start agreement.

Draft agreements exist in Virginia, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Texas, Nevada, and Saipan.

Other Collaborative Efforts with SEAs

Beyond efforts to deliver written SEA/Head Start agreements, RAPs work at several levels to develop relationships between SEAs, Head Start and RAPs. At one level, RAPs and SEAs engage in what might be described as general maintenance of their relationships, that is, they call or meet periodically, forward relevant materials to each other, share information, and serve as resources to the other. The following illustrations draw on both field interviews with RAP staff and telephone inquiries with representatives of each SEA:

- 32 SEAs reported they are members of RAP advisory committees, which keep them informed of Head Start's mainstreaming efforts and handicap efforts in other states.
- 48 SEAs reported they exchange information with RAPs through the mail, by phone, or in person.
- In New Mexico, Alaska and Colorado, SEAs and RAPs share information regarding available services to facilitate the placement of handicapped children.
- The Region III RAP has assisted the Washington D.C., SEA by identifying Head Start children with whom it would be appropriate to pilot-test new materials.
- The Illinois SEA served on a review board to hire new RAP staff.

As RAPs have become more familiar with SEA resources and policies, it has been appropriate to broaden their role from speaking for Head Start to finding ways to put Head Starts and SEAs directly in touch with each other. In this way RAPs provide opportunities for SEA to communicate information which affects Head Start in a state, and they also help to remove misconceptions which may strain communication between state-level decision makers and Head Start personnel:

- Through SEA attendance at meetings of Head Start handicap coordinators in Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Iowa, Nebraska, and Utah, Head Starts have been kept abreast of procedures to apply for state funds, dates for meetings, workshops, conferences, and pending legislation.

- Staff from 19 SEAs have attended RAP functions, and of those, 13 have been keynote speakers or facilitators at RAP conferences.

- The NYU RAP provided the New York SEA with mailing labels for every Head Start grantee and delegate so the SEA could send relevant information and newsbriefs.

At yet another level, RAPs have found it important to seek membership on SEA committees and task forces in order to facilitate collaboration for Head Starts and LEAs, as well as to shape policies and plans affecting handicapped preschoolers:

- This year the Nashville RAP participated on the Tennessee Preschool Services Planning Committee, formally representing Head Start among state agencies serving handicapped preschool children. The committee has received an an ACYF grant to link preschool programs with community services. The RAP and the Tennessee SEA are also members of the State Early Intervention Network.

- The Texas Tech RAP sits on an Arkansas SEA task force which is exploring the replication of Head Start's mainstreaming model in the public school system. The RAP has provided information about Head Start's agreement with Arkansas as well as Head Start regulations.

The RAPs' advocacy and participation in efforts to bring Head Starts and SEAs together have played an important role in making SEAs aware of Head Start. Increasingly, SEAs are sharing resources with Head Start for the benefit of handicapped children. For their part, Head Starts have shared or have been encouraged to share their own training resources with the public school systems:

- The Los Angeles RAP continues to serve on an Interagency Task Force in California through which state departments and the Developmental Disabilities Council coordinate services to preschool handicapped children. Growing out of training on building community teams, the RAP has developed a community collaboration project with the state's Special Education Resource Network (SERN).

- Head Starts are eligible for funds funneled through public school systems in Massachusetts, South Carolina, Florida, North Carolina, Louisiana, Arizona, and Washington. In Florida, when the SEA notes that Head Start is not mentioned in an LEA application, the Chapel Hill RAP and the appropriate area coordinator are alerted to find the reason.

- In Arizona, the Los Angeles RAP and the SEA have met several times to discuss bringing Head Starts receiving Part B EHA LEA entitlement funds into compliance with PL 94-142.

- The University of Illinois RAP is working with the Indiana SEA to plan dual enrollment in Head Start and public schools.

- In New Hampshire the SEA intervened when Head Starts were having difficulty getting diagnoses through public schools.

- The Region VII RAP and the Nebraska SEA co-sponsored a conference for Head Start and LEAs on serving preschool handicapped children, and organized an Interagency Early Childhood Coordinating Committee, a network of early childhood special education providers who exchange resources.

- Six RAPs encourage Head Starts to invite LEA staff to RAP training conferences.

- The Alaska SEA committed money to the Alaska RAP to reprint "A Parent's Guide to Special Education." Also the SEA funded the RAP to replicate its services for the public school system. When the preschool coordinator in the Lower Kuskokwim School District asked the Alaska RAP to provide training for special education aides, the RAP agreed on the condition that Head Start staff be included in the training as well.

Finally, RAPs and SEAs have frequently worked together to put information and specific strategies in the hands of Head Start personnel so they can obtain services to which handicapped children are entitled:

- In Connecticut, the New Engand RAP and ACYF/Region I drafted and put into effect a second interagency agreement with the SEA to provide joint technical assistance to Head Starts in implementing the state agreement at the local level. Guided and trained by an Interagency Steering Committee, two-person teams representing Head Start and the SEA are working with four sites to learn which collaborative procedures are most effective in which settings.

- At the request of the Oregon SEA, the PSU RAP reviewed a manual written for school districts about guidelines and procedural policies for collaborative agreements, to determine how they affect Head Start, and whether Head Start is appropriately represented.

- The Mississippi RAP arranged for Head Starts to attend training offered by the SEA to assist in filling out forms which would get services for children earlier. The RAP also provided handicap coordinators with information about PL 94-142 and the state plan, so they could make recommendations regarding the plan.

- In Massachusetts, the New England RAP reintroduced to handicap coordinators the "Young and Special" curriculum which the SEA had made available to Head Start. One handicap coordinator incorporated the curriculum, and other resources, in an eight-session inservice training package. The RAP and the State Training Center reviewed and revised the content, and arranged for college credit for the training.

During telephone interviews with SEAs in Spring 1983, evaluators asked SEA representatives about their satisfaction with the RAPs' work, what types of contacts they had, which services SEAs valued most, and whether SEAs had any suggestions for improving RAPs' work. More complete information about RAP/SEA interactions can be found in Table 5.4 and Table 5.5 on the following pages and in the individual RAP Summaries in Appendix B. Interviews were completed with 53 of the 57 SEAs (93 percent) with whom RAPs worked in 1982-83.

SEA satisfaction with RAPs' work in 1982-83 rose to 3.5 on a four-point scale, the highest recorded over five years. Only two respondents reported no contact with RAPs. In one of these states, the SEA has historically worked with the state training facility, and communicates with RAP only indirectly. In the other, the SEA reported there had not been contact with RAP this year. The respondent also felt RAP training was not based on the unique needs of Head Start in that location.

SEAs reported an average of four different types of contacts. The findings, consistent with past surveys, identify the most common types of interaction between SEAs as information exchange, meetings, workshops and conferences, advisory committee meetings, and materials exchange. Evaluators also learned that the majority of contacts between RAPs and SEAs were mutually initiated (66%), and that 58 percent were in contact monthly or more often. SEAs most valued RAP as, first, a resource for information, materials, and technical assistance; second, for training; and third, for RAP services as liaison among the SEAs, Head Starts, and LEAs.

Relationships Among Satisfaction and Other Factors

The evaluators wanted to know what causes high satisfaction among SEA respondents. Cases were compared having the highest satisfaction scores (4.0) with those having somewhat less high scores (3.0 to 3.9) and those with the lowest (less than 3.0). Findings are displayed in Table 5.6 along with results for each group for the numbers of types of contact,

Table 5.4

Profile of RAP/SEA Interaction, Program by Program
June 1982 - June 1983

CHARACTERISTICS	NE	NYU	R III	CH	NASH	MS	UofI	PP	TT	UK	DENVER	LA	PACIF	PSU	AK	NATIONAL	
Frequency Index 4 = more than monthly; 3 = monthly; 2 = occasionally (6-11 x/yr); 1 = infrequently (1-5 x/yr); 0 = never	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.0	3.7	3.0	2.0	3.5	2.5	3.3	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.8	
Initiator of Contacts (Number of SEAs)																# SEA	% SEA
Mutual	4	2	5	4	2	-	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	35	66%
RAP	1	2	-	-	1	1	2	-	2	1	3	1	1	1	-	16	30
SEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
No Initiation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	4
No Interviews	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	NA
Nature of Contacts (# of SEAs) (Unpromoted)																# SEA	% SEA
Advisory committee	3	2	2	3	1	-	3	2	1	4	5	3	2	-	1	32	60%
Mt, wkshp, conf (not AC)	5	4	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	4	5	1	4	-	-	37	70
Materials	1	4	2	2	1	-	1	2	4		1	2	-	1	-	21	40
SEA/HS collaboration	-	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	2	1	-	15	28
LEA/HS collaboration	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	8	15
SEA used as provider	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	9
RAP used as provider	2	2	-	2	2	-	-	1	3	2	-	3	-	-	-	17	32
Info exchange	5	3	5	4	3	-	3	1	4	4	6	3	4	2	1	48	91
Mutual project	3	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	13	25
SIG	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	6
Other	1	-	2	1	2	-	2	-	1	2	2	2	2	-	1	18	34
Introductory contact	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	4
Average No. of Types of SEA/RAP contact per service area	4.8	4.5	3.4	4.8	4.3	2.0	5.0	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.8	4.7	3.0	2.7	3.0	4.0	
Satisfaction Grade Enthusiastic (4.0); Satisfied (3.0-3.9); Some reservations (2.0-2.9); Dissatisfied (1.0-1.9);	4.0	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.7	4.0	2.9	3.6	3.7	3.7	2.5	2.5	4.0	3.5	

Table 5.5
National Profile of RAP/SEA Interactions
June 1983, with Comparative Findings From
1981 and 1982

CHARACTERISTICS	Percentage of SEAs Responding in: 1983 (Base: 53)	1982 (Base: 51)	1981 (Base: 53)
Frequency of Contact:			
4=More than monthly	28 %	29 %	26 %
3=Monthly	30	18	26
2=Occasionally (6-11 x/yr)	28	33	21
1=Infrequently (1-5 x/yr)	9	10	19
0=Never	4	8	8
Frequency Index	2.8	2.6	2.5
Initiation of Contact:			
Mutual	66	63	74
RAP	30	25	17
SEA	0	0	2
No initiation	4	12	8
Nature of Contacts:			
Advisory Committee	60 %	53 %	62 %
Mtgs, Wkshops, Confs.	70	73	64
Materials	40	43	36
SEA/HS collaboration	28	37	42
LEA/HS collaboration	15	14	9
SEA used as provider	9	20	8
RAP used as provider	32	16	26
Information exchange	91	82	85
Mutual project	25	22	9
State plan	0	2	0
SIG	6	2	4
Other	34	33	8
Introductory contact	2	8	17
None	4	8	8
Average No. Types of Contact	4.0	4.1	3.9
Satisfaction:			
Enthusiastic (4.0)	53 %	47 %	45 %
Satisfied (3.0 - 3.9)	34	39	34
Some reservations (2.0 - 2.9)	2	4	2
Dissatisfied (1.0 - 1.9)	0	0	2
No opinion (1.0)	6	8	6
No opinion (0)	6	2	11
National "Grade"	3.5	3.3	3.4
Problems encountered in dealing with RAP:			
No	98 %	98 %	89 %
Yes	2	2	11

Table 5.6

Correlations of SEA Satisfaction

Satisfaction	No. of SEAs	No. of Types of Contact	Mutually Initiated	Frequency of Contact					Number Offering Suggestions
				Monthly or More	Monthly	Occas-ionally	Infre-quency	None	
High (4.0)	28	6.8	85%	43%	32%	21%	4%	0%	21%
Medium (3.0-3.9)	18	3.9	56	22	22	44	11	0	50
Low (Less than 3.0)	4*	2.3	0	0	25	0	25	50	75

*Evaluators assigned values of 1.0 for three of these SEAs because SEA had had no contact and therefore could not give satisfaction scores.

mutually initiated contact, most frequent communication (more often than monthly), and suggestions.

So few SEA's report really "low" satisfaction that this group cannot be very representative; however, sharp differences still appear between the "high" and "medium" groups. The most satisfied respondents were those with whom contact was varied, mutual, and frequent. The variety of types of contact for the high scoring group averaged 6.8, compared to 3.9 for the "medium" group and 2.3 of the "low" group. Eighty-five percent of the SEAs expressing highest satisfaction had a relationship where contacts were initiated mutually compared to 56 percent of the SEAs with "medium" satisfaction and none of those among the less satisfied respondents. Moreover, exchanges between SEA and RAP occurred most frequently, that is more often than monthly, among 43 percent of the most satisfied respondents, whereas only 22 percent of the medium satisfaction SEAs and none of the low scoring SEAs indicated such frequent communication.

Finally, although all groups offered suggestions to improve RAPs' work, the less satisfied cases were more apt to make these suggestions.

When the contacts were mutually initiated, the satisfaction grade was 3.7, compared to 3.2 when contacts were initiated by RAPs. No cases of contacts initiated by SEAs were reported. When mutually initiated, contact tended to be more frequent (37%) than when contact was RAP-initiated (13%), and more types of contact were reported (4.9 compared to 2.9) than when RAP alone was the initiator.

Frequency of contact, SEA satisfaction, and number of types of contact for each RAP's home state were compared with the rest of the RAP's service area. (No comparisons were made for the two RAPs that serve only one SEA or for one other RAP where no interview was held with its "home" state.) For ten of the remaining 12 RAPs, contact was more frequent with the SEA in their home state than for the rest of the service area; for the other two RAPs, contact was less frequent with the "local" SEA. Of note is that satisfaction was 4.0 in <u>all</u> of the "home" states, and all of the home-state SEAs reported mutually-initiated contacts.

<u>Head Start/LEA Agreements</u>

In addition to their work with SEAs, RAPs are expected to facilitate local agreements in states where there are signed SEA agreements and, where appropriate, in states where SEA agreements do not yet exist. As a contract deliverable, each RAP must report the number of LEAs in each state and the number of signed Head Start/LEA agreements in the state. (There are no "local" education agencies, and thus no LEA/Head Start agreements, in the Pacific RAP's service area.) From the RAPs' count, based on PIR and their own data, 472 Head Start/LEA agreements currently exist. The contracts do not require that these be facilitated by RAP. RAPs are intended to support collaboration at the local level, but they are not expected to deliver agreements between LEAs with whom they have

no established relationship, authority, or responsibility, and Head Starts whose relationship to school districts is often equally uncharted.

The context for a potential Head Start/LEA agreement varies widely. A Head Start's catchment area may be part of, overlap with, or coincide with a school district's boundaries. Where agreements exist, they range from informal "gentlemen's agreements" and letters of intent to formal, signed written agreements. Despite concerns about territorial and funding issues, some RAPs report an increased willingness among Head Starts and the LEAs to work together.

The roles RAPs have chosen to play in fostering relationships between Head Starts and LEAs have varied. Some have directly negotiated LEA/Head Start agreements:

- This year 12 agreements were directly facilitated by RAPs (New England, Mississippi, University of Denver, Los Angeles, and Alaska). Table 5.7 summarizes key points of these agreements.

Several RAPs have conducted workshops and conferences specifically on collaboration, many of these open to LEAs as well as Head Starts:

- 10 RAPs have held workshops on the importance of collaboration, barriers, methods for collaboration, and potential areas for collaboration.

- The coordinator of the Region III RAP offered training on the Community Team Workbook at conferences conducted by three other RAPs.

- The University of Denver RAP staff planned and implemented a conference on collaboration in Utah, and invited SEA representatives as speakers. RAP staff also served as facilitators when participants at a Colorado SEA conference initiated cooperative efforts to serve handicapped preschoolers.

In addition to the training, RAPs have provided technical assistance to Head Starts and LEAs which may have required one time telephone technical assistance or, in other instances, ongoing expertise.

- In Florida, several Head Starts and LEAs planned and developed joint training. Specially Funded Coordinators (SFCs) facilitated the training, with the assistance of the Chapel Hill RAP in brainstorming activities and preparing handouts and agendas.

- Concerned that children were not getting service quickly enough after they had been screened, Mississippi RAP used

Table 5.7

LEA/Head Start Agreements Directly Facilitated by RAP, 1983

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
New England RAP	Citizens for Citizens, Inc. Head Start Fall River School District (MA)	• LEA agrees to - provide screening and diagnostic services - provide a full range of educational and support services to all identified eligible handicapped 3-5 year olds and/or children dually enrolled in Head Start and the LEA's preschool program (e.g., speech therapy, physical therapy) - coordinate with Head Start staff to plan for a smooth transition for the eligible handicapped children enrolled only in Head Start to public school - provide in-service training to Head Start staff and lend audio-visual presentations, various materials and in-service training packages. • Head Start will - refer all Head Start children as suspected eligible for special education and support services to the LEA - assist in the screening process on site - assist when necessary in scheduling and follow through with appointments for further diagnostic testing - provide a comprehensive early childhood developmental program - assist LEA in implementing Child Find activities

-97-

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
New England (cont'd)	Thames Valley Council for Community Action New London CT Board of Education	• Head Start will be an appropriate placement for young handicapped children who have gone through the LEA diagnostic process. • Head Start will participate in the development of IEPs for children accepted into Head Start. • When the planning and placement team (PPT) feels it appropriate, children will be jointly placed in home based programs and in public school, and those children will be given priority. • Preschool staff of the LEA will provide appropriate educational support and related services to enable the Head Start program to implement the IEP. • Preschool staff of Head Start will provide appropriate educational support and related services to enable provision of parent education for the families of children placed in an LEA setting.
	T.E.A.M. Head Start Ansonia Public Schools (CT)	• LEA agrees to provide: - special education assessments for all children who have suspected handicaps - occupational and physical therapy services as deemed necessary by the school planning and placement team - speech and language services - adaptive physical education services - special education instructional materials - transportation as needed

Location	Signing Parties	Key Points
New England RAP (cont'd)	T.E.A.M. Head Start Ansonia Public Schools (cont'd)	• Head Start agrees to - inform LEA personnel of Head Start's recruitment procedures and schedules - evaluate each child for his/her appropriateness for Head Start placement - serve as a mainstream setting for special education students who are receiving or may need special education services - upon parent invitation, Head Start will participate in PPT meetings

RAP	Signing Parties	Key Points
Mississippi	Pearl River Opportunity Council Columbia Municipal Separate School District	• LEA will - screen, evaluate and place all children • Head Start will - provide supervised facilities - provide transportation to the screening - provide appropriate intervention after screening - serve as a liaison between the public school and the families of children eligible for assessment • Head Start and the LEA will - share Child Find data - plan for and attend each other's training - develop IEPs jointly as appropriate
University of Denver	San Luis Valley Board of Co-operative Services (BOCES), Colorado	• Head Start will be responsible for - health and social/emotional histories of children - developing IEPs • BOCES will be responsible for - screenings - assessment - referrals - Child Find
University of Denver	Grand Junction Head Start	• Head Start and the LEA will collaborate to - provide those professional services to Head Start which the latter does not have access to - smooth the transitioning process for children moving from Head Start to public schools

RAP	Signing Parties	Key Points
Los Angeles	San Diego County Head Start 5 school districts	Each agreement outlines - referral procedures - joint planning for assessments - planning for IEPs - individual or joint provision of services
Alaska	RurAL CAP Lower Kuskokwim School District	In order to provide special education services to children in Head Start, • LEA will - convene a committee with Head Start representation to hire a special education aide to work with diagnosed children in Head facilities - fund the aide position - provide training and technical assistance through the LEA's case coordinator, RAP, Head Start, or another approved provider • Head Start will - provide the facilities - supervise the aides

a task force of LEA speech pathologists and Head Start handicap coordinators to identify solutions. As a result, handicap coordinators will be asked to send a list of identified children rather than diagnostic reports to the public school; the public schools will then assume responsibility for getting diagnoses completed sooner.

RAPs also have disseminated sample agreements and issued special publications on collaboration:

- The New York University and Portland State University RAPs have used canvass calls to determine how many collaborative agreements exist, with whom, what the terms are, and what further steps Head Start has taken to implement collaboration.

- The Portage and University of Illinois RAPs, as members of Region V's "Our Special Effort" initiative, wrote a paper on local-level collaboration. They also added an interagency workbook as a section of The Handicap Services Guide. Both RAPs are training handicap coordinators to use this manual.

Collaboration With Other Agencies

In addition to their work with public school systems, RAPs cultivate linkages and networking opportunities with other agencies. This allows RAPs to further broaden the base for ideas and action on behalf of young handicapped children, and to solve specific problems. Many other federal and community agencies have their own mandates to serve preschool handicapped children; it behooves these agencies (as well as Head Start) to optimize resources by pooling them. Typical of cooperative work with agencies other than public schools have been agreements with Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/Disabled Children's Offices, Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT), Departments of Health, and private service providers, as well as cooperation with these and other agencies to provide direct services for specific children. This year RAP also made training appearances before chapters of the Council for Exceptional Children, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, and universities. RAPs also used staff from these and other groups as conference presenters and cooperated with larger networks or committees to provide services:

- Both the Alaska RAP and Alaska Resources for the Moderately and Severely Impaired (ARMSI) are mandated to serve the state's 3 to 5 year old population. ARMSI has agreed to refer that age group to RAP unless the RAP feels they would be better served through ARMSI's severely impaired program. ARMSI serves children from 3 to 19.

- Because many Head Starts in Mississippi had not been receiving referrals from local health departments, RAP met with representatives of a health district which had developed an effective referral model. As a result, RAP will disseminate a list of contact people at boards of health for handicap coordinators' use during recruitment. Health departments will send a list of children who have been screened and are not known to Head Start, placing an asterisk by the names of children who have failed screenings so the handicap coordinator can follow up.

- The Region VII RAP was instrumental in forming the Interagency Early Childhood Coordinating Committee in Nebraska, intended to offset fragmentation among service providers, provide an ongoing forum, and facilitate networking and exchanges of resources.

- The New England and Nashville RAPs have collaborated with the Rural Network, a national network started by HCEEP directors concerned about serving handicapped children in rural settings. As a member of the Rural Network, the New England RAP was on a planning committee for a conference of legislators and key SEA administrators regarding interagency coordination of services to handicapped children. The RAP produced a booklet on all of the services available to handicapped children in participating states, contributed copies of the Community Team Workbook, and helped to facilitate sessions. Commissioners of education, service providers, and parents discussed their resources and returned to their communities with a plan to serve handicapped children.

- The Pacific RAP collaborated with Head Start and the Communications Disorders Center in Saipan to involve parents and staff in the mainstreaming effort through an intensive five-week course. RAP staff taught portions of the course and arranged for college credit through the University of Guam. Participants were trained on the handicapping conditions, observed teachers working with handicapped children in the classroom, and developed IEPs.

- The Texas Tech RAP initiated the formation of the Task Force of Texas State Agencies of Community Services Providers to minimize the duplication of funds and services in the state.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services and the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services are joining forces in a project to improve services to young handicapped children.

The goal of the project is two-fold: (1) to update materials used to mainstream handicapped children into Head Start programs across the country; and (2) to expand a training program developed by Head Start to prevent abuse and neglect of young handicapped children. With the collaboration of public school personnel this prevention program will also include school aged handicapped children 5 through 8 years.

In this developmental year, five RAPs have been selected as sites to develop and field test the materials for the prevention of child abuse and neglect of young handicapped children in Head Start programs and public schools.

6.

PARTICIPATE IN RAP TASK FORCES

RAP task forces have been used by the government project officer as a mechanism for responding to current issues and needs; they have proven to be a convenient, flexible, and effective means for getting additional work done quickly. In the past, task forces have been formed to develop materials where none existed (e.g., "What Does PL 94-142 Mean to Head Start?") to facilitate the implementation of new RAP tasks (e.g., collaborative checklists and compilations of sample collaborative agreements) and to actualize ideas (the computerized management information system).

Concerns from the Head Start community which RAP staff have brought to national RAP meetings have spurred the formation of a task force (child abuse and neglect), as have the concerns of the government project officer or other federal administrators (incidence of speech/language impairments, PA26, and innovative programs for serving severely impaired children).

Each RAP volunteers or is selected by ACYF for participation in one to four task forces each year. During the evaluation year from July, 1982 to July, 1983, seven task forces existed for some period of time. Two task forces (Preschool Computers and Technology, and Linkages with National Organizations) were short-lived and members identified neither accomplishments nor problems. The focus of one (CDA/Language Curriculum) was shifted from defining criteria for credentialing to language development, and will continue in the next program year. Having completed its assignment, the computer task force ended at the February national RAP meeting in San Diego. Overall, RAPs report that this task is of moderate importance.

This section will discuss the accomplishments of the following task forces: Computer, PA26, Innovative Approaches to Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children, Child Abuse and Neglect, and Language Development. Problems and recommendations growing out of members' task force experience will close the section.

Computer Task Force

Members: New England (Chair), NYU, Chapel Hill, Region VII, University of Denver, Los Angeles RAPs and Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc.

This task force played the pivotal role in the realization of the RAP management information system. Members selected computer hardware and

software, researched means of funding these, tailored attributes to better reflect RAPs' work, developed a program profile to collect census data on Head Starts, designed and delivered computer training for RAPs, and wrote a self-instructional manual on the use of RAPPLE. In addition, this task force acted in an advisory capacity to the computer management project.

PA26 Task Force

Members: Region VII (Chair), New England, Chapel Hill, Nashville, Portage, Texas Tech, Los Angeles RAPs.

Originally the PA26 task force, was instructed to give counsel to the national Head Start office on the usage of PA26 funds, problems that exist in PA26 expenditures (usually carryover balances), and solutions to the problems identified. Members began their work by collecting information about ways local programs were using the account and by generating a list of issues related to PA26. Task force objectives were subsequently changed by ACYF from focusing on PA26 carryover balances to writing the guidance for PA26. At this point, the task force has met with ACYF administrators twice and drafted a revision of Head Start Transmittal Notice 73.4, Services to Handicapped Children.

Task Force On Innovative Approaches To Increasing The Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Members: NYU (Chair), New England, Chapel Hill, University of Illinois, University of Denver, Pacific and Alaska RAPs.

A task force on serving severely handicapped children was formed to aid Head Starts' efforts to identify and recruit children with severe handicaps. The task force set the following objectives at their first meeting:

- Review regional PIR data to identify programs where severely handicapped children are not being served.
- Call those Head Starts to determine the severity of the handicapping conditions of any children who were not admitted and to determine reasons for not serving them.
- Identify programs with a high enrollment of severely handicapped children and research their reasons for using PA26 funds in this manner.

At a subsequent meeting this task force drafted guidance to encourage grantees to enroll increased numbers of children who have severely handicapping conditions. The task force also collaborated with the PA26 task force to draft a revision of Head Start Transmittal Notice 73.4, Services to Handicapped Children.

Child Abuse and Neglect Task Force

Members: Region III (Chair), Chapel Hill, Mississippi, Portage, Texas Tech, Los Angeles, Portland State University, and Alaska RAPs.

Due to concern about the rising incidence of abuse and neglect of handicapped children, ACYF formed this task force to collaborate with the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) to develop cooperative products. Three grants were awarded by NCCAN to RAPs to create new resources addressing this problem. Chapel Hill received funds to develop training for volunteers and social service staff to establish a demonstration site, to design training materials for use in rural areas, and, under subcontract with Region III, to design training materials for urban areas. Portage RAP received an NCCAN grant to prepare training materials to alleviate the stresses on parents of handicapped children; they have subcontracted with Region III RAP for materials to be used in training parents.

PSU RAP received NCCAN funding to develop training materials (based on the Head Start transmittal notice on child abuse TN No. 77.2, Identification and Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect, Policy Instruction) on procedures for identifying, following, and resolving potential abuse and neglect cases. PSU RAP subcontracted with Los Angeles RAP to examine ways of facilitating interagency agreements among those serving preschool handicapped children. PSU RAP also subcontracted with the Regional Child Abuse and Neglect Center in Region X to evaluate procedures currently in place in Head Start for dealing with child abuse and neglect.

The final product of the task force will be a comprehensive, multimedia training package containing training for social service aides, a primary prevention manual, and a slide tape show already prepared by Chapel Hill RAP. Members have also started a bibliography of current information and identified resources dealing with child abuse.

Language Development Task Force

Members: NYU (Chair), Chapel Hill, Nashville, Mississippi, University of Illinois, Texas Tech, University of Denver, Los Angeles, PSU, and Alaska RAPs.

The language development task force was formed in August 1982. Members first gathered existing materials appropriate for Head Start's use for language development and reviewed them. Future objectives are to develop criteria for judging language development materials, to design a checklist for Head Start teachers based on these criteria, and to write an annotated bibliography of materials. Ultimately, the task force may develop a training package on language development. A slide tape show on language development has been produced by Chapel Hill RAP and the script is being circulated for comment among Head Starts.

Problems

Two problems related to task force work have surfaced repeatedly in recent years. First, RAPs reported their focus was diffused because they had not received clear mandates and guidelines nor specific goals from ACYF. Second, set budgets and staff time allotments often did not adequately cover the costs and time associated with task force work, especially when members attended multiple meetings.

RAPs suggested several means of rectifying the problems identified. ACYF should thoroughly articulate goals and objectives before initiating new task forces. The Government Project Officer should attend all task force meetings and follow-up throughout the year on work and products being developed. RAPs should be notified if any task force is discontinued. Task Force membership might be assigned by region (i.e., neighboring RAPs serve on the same task force) to reduce travel. More money must be allowed for staff travel and expenses, keeping in mind that many RAPs are members of more than one task force.

7.

ESTABISH AND UPDATE A FILE OF RESOURCE PROVIDERS

In order to support the delivery of high quality services to handicapped children in Head Start, all RAPs must develop a file of resource providers in their service area. RAPs add resources as they become known, and regularly review them to insure the quality, availability, and cost of the references contained in the file. Overall, RAPs report that this task is of moderate importance.

Since there is a natural limitation to any RAP's time and expertise, RAPs expanded their capability to meet Head Start staff needs through additional specialists and materials. All RAPs used speialists to some extent to train Head Start staff, either at conferences or on-site. Many RAPs (10 RAPs) also turned to others, on occasion, to provide on-site technical assistance to programs. Written materials developed by others (sometimes under RAP contracts) were made available to Head Start staff at conferences, through mailings, or in RAP reference libraries (9 RAPs).

RAPs reported that they themselves benefited from using resources they locate. Outside resources provided technical assistance directly to RAP (5 RAPs), suggested other referral sources or gave general information (10 RAPs), and also aided RAPs in collaborating with other agencies (2 RAPs).

The third level at which outside providers had an impact was on individual Head Start children. Six RAPs reported that specialists had been used to diagnose or treat children in local programs.

Two RAPs also reported that outside resources were utilized in publicizing and advocating for needs and services to handicapped children in their service area. The number of resource providers indexed in the RAP network totaled 6,914 in 1982-83, an increase of 110 over last year's figures. Of these, RAPs reported using only about eight percent (570) actively. On the average, each RAP used 38 additional resources regularly, with a range of 10 in Los Angeles to 75 at PSU.

Comparing figures from this year and last year shows that RAPs were more conservative in their use of outside providers in 1982-83. The number of providers frequently used decreased at nine RAPs and stayed the same at three. Los Angeles RAP added only a few providers to its list of resources used frequently, but still remains the lowest. PSU and NYU showed more dramatic increases. PSU RAP quadrupled the number of local consultants used as presenters at its training conferences this year. Its efforts to match the needs and resources of specific geographic areas could account for the size of its resource provider file.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

The development of the automated management system has been slow and problemsome. The fourth year of RAP operation was a pivotal year for the system, as ACYF was prepared to drop the computerized system if its efficacy could not be demonstrated. During that year a RAP computer task force was appointed; ACYF named New England RAP as chair. Not only was this task force instrumental in determining how the ARAMIS contractor proceeded that year, but also it assumed responsibility for the standardization of recordkeeping procedures and definitions, for developing the framework for a replacement system radically different from the pilot, and for advising the ARAMIS contractor to inform all computerized RAPs of changes in software through periodic bulletins. In program year 1980-81, the ARAMIS contractor was defunded. The New England RAP was selected to develop the computerized program and the task force developed an interim manual recordkeeping system. By the sixth year, the RAP network had progressed from the original manual system through a problem-ridden automated management system to a new computerized MIS which was almost fully operational. All 15 RAPs received Apple III hardware and prepackaged software to develop and operate the system, again as a result of the joint efforts of the task force and the New England RAP.

ACYF had awarded New England RAP, chair of the computer task force, additional funds in 1981-82 to carry out a short-term computer management project. The project was again funded in 1982-83 to allow completion of software, and to assist RAPs as they implemented the system.

RAPPLE, a tailor-made software program for RAP use, was completed this year, ending the network's quest for a uniform and workable management information system. RAPPLE consists of five separate programs:

- Head Start/Non-Head Start Program (agencies)
- Provider Program
- Resource Program
- Activity Program
- Task Program

The function to tally data is only partially completed.

The computer management project conducted training on the RAPPLE program at the National RAP meeting in February 1983, disseminated the RAPPLE manual, and continued to disseminate regular bulletins on the network's use of the computer, business details, and innovative practices. The New England RAP, through the computer management project, purchased software for each RAP which allows each to communicate with any other Apple III that has a modem and similar software. Access to CompuServe, a service that allows electronic mailing, was also purchased for each RAP.

Is The System Working?

Following training on the completed RAPPLE system in February, 1983, all RAPs were directed by ACYF to implement the integrated RAPPLE system by March 1, 1983. The status of implementation efforts follow:

- All 15 RAPs have entered all Head Start agencies.
- Thirteen RAPs have entered some activities (NE, RIII, CH, NASH, MS, UI, PP, TTU, RVII, DU, LA, PSU, AK).
- Ten RAPs have entered at least some task records (NE, RIII, NASH, MS, UI, PP, TTU, RVII, PSU, AK).
- Ten RAPs have entered some providers (NE, NY, MS, UI, PP, TTU, DU, PACIFIC, PSU, AK). Two had entered all providers (NASH, LA).
- Nine RAPs have entered some resources (CH, NASH, MS, PP, TTU, DU, PACIFIC, PSU, AK).
- Six RAPs have made at least some entries in each category (NASH, MS, PP, TTU, PSU, AK).

Evaluators found that RAPs are pleased with the computerized system, and are deriving great satisfaction from mastering it. Most RAPs ranked this task as moderately important; the balance considered it of major importance. Automation has granted RAPs a mechanism for tapping large information systems and documenting the services they provide. RAPs are finding the system easy to use. Several have moved beyond entering and retrieving data to experimenting with ways to make their work easier.

- Texas Tech uses the computer to track what training grantees have had, staff turnover, and the predictability of certain handicapping conditions within a grantee.
- By retrieving data according to handicapping condition, NYU is linking up Head Starts who have served children with the same conditions.
- RAPs are also using the system to write proposals and reports.

RAPs have been complimentary of the work of the computer specialist at the New England RAP's computer management project to facilitate their implementation of the system during the year.

The system has some limitations, but they are minor and correctable. There are not enough descriptors for providers. The system is slow and it takes time to enter and retrieve data. The RAPPLE task record asks for a summary, but does not summarize new entries. Attributes are not numbered on the screen, requiring staff to return to the manual to number

them. Three RAPs have had mechanical problems with hardware, and three have had difficulties with prepackaged software.

Most RAPs duplicate the recording of data, one person filling out the request on a paper form, and another entering the information into the computer. Staffs are suspended between the manual and automated systems, wanting to adopt the latter, but stumped by logistics or by their biases toward their own foolproof paper systems.

In reviewing and analyzing RAP's recordkeeping practices this year, evaluators can make the overall observation that the redefinition of attributes and types of activities, the training on the definitions, and the availability of the RAPPLE manual have helped RAPs to apply the system more uniformly. Evaluators can also offer specific observations on the recording of activities, tasks, and attributes:

Activities

- RAPs are now entering complete background data for each service requestor (name, title, state, etc.).
- RAPs are entering more detailed information about each request and the service provided although this is still too cursory at two RAPs.

Attributes

- The addition of a RAP-specific category allows more RAPs to capture work unique to their service areas.
- Attributes are being used more accurately, uniformly and conservatively (fewer rather than more). There is less of a tendency to use such attributes as "mainstreaming" and "administrative planning" for a wide range of activities.
- The service code for handicapping conditions is still not consistently used.
- Not all RAPs are entering attributes on task records.

Task Records

- The extent of detail in task records still varies widely. Content is too abbreviated at two RAPs.
- Not all RAPs are entering attributes on task records.
- There is still some confusion about how to code types of task records, usually training, meetings, collaboration.

- RAPs are still unclear about when SEA or LEA events should be one task record or more.
- Events associated with one task record are often recorded as separate task records.
- There are fewer duplications of task records, or of activities and task records than in previous years.
- RAPs were more likely to record numbers and positions of trainees.
- RAPs were less likely to overlook creating task records for work that qualified (e.g., implementation of MIS, task forces, etc.).

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Every year RAPs assess their grantees' needs for assistance in meeting the mainstreaming goals of each Head Start program. Since methods for performing these needs assessments are not mandated in RAPs' contracts, the format, content, and procedures used vary from RAP to RAP. Some RAPs have developed formal written assessment tools or use existing regional systems for gathering the information. Other methods include interviews at meetings (e.g., directors' meetings, coordinators' meetings, etc.) or during site visits to grantees, telephone interviews, and combinations of several of the above methods. In addition, at least once per quarter many RAPs contact each grantee and discuss changes, problems, and needs -- usually more informally.

RAPs contend that the combination of in-depth assessments and periodic follow-up enables them to match their technical assistance, materials, and training to programs' identified areas of greatest need and to maintain a supportive informed relationship with programs as needs change during the course of the year. Eighty-seven percent of RAPs rated needs assessment as a task of major importance.

Nationally, RAPs assessed the handicap component needs of 97 percent of grantees they served in 1982-83. This compares to 93 percent of grantees assessed last year and 92 percent assessed the year before. Ten RAPs assessed the needs of 100 percent of programs in their service area. With the exception of one RAP (University of Illinois) that achieved only 73 percent participation, all others completed needs assessments for 90 percent or more of the programs they served.

During on-site evaluation meetings with RLA, RAP staff were asked what they had perceived to be grantees' areas of greatest need for assistance, based on the previous year's needs assessment. Most frequently cited (8 RAPs) as a major need this year was assistance on managing difficult behavior in a classroom setting. Training on IEPs fell to second in priority, with seven RAPs reporting frequent requests for assistance on this topic. In keeping with last year, many RAPs continued to see a need for training related to working with parents or families of handicapped children and for information on the specific handicapping conditions. Handicapping conditions thought to be most problematic for programs were, like last year, emotional disturbance and learning disabilities. Information on speech and language handicaps and on health disabilities was perceived by fewer RAPs as being a priority. Though help with IEPs, specific handicapping conditions, and working with families continue to be considered by RAPs to be in the top four needs, in comparison to last year's findings there has been a diminution, overall, in the number of RAPs which report these as being high priorities.

Important, but less frequently cited, needs were training on identifying and working with abused or neglected children, and information and assistance on working with other agencies - both LEAs and additional community resources. A few RAPs felt their grantees needed training on strengthening speech and language skills and on administering and managing the handicap component. Administrative questions mentioned related to PA26 funds and the PIR.

Individual RAPs reported program needs in a variety of other areas. Three RAPs reported receiving different questions related to supporting staff in various ways - e.g., stress/job burnout prevention, improving teacher self-esteem, attracting and keeping volunteers. Other individual RAPs saw a need in their service area for assistance on homebased Head Start, social service's relationship to handicap services, nutrition, transitioning children to other programs, or early warning signs of disabilities.

10.

NATIONAL RAP MEETINGS

The bi-annual national RAP meetings this year took place in Seattle, Washington, August 23-27, 1982, and in San Diego, California, February 21-15, 1983. Since these meetings are always attended by representatives from the National ACYF Office as well as each RAP, they are planned to provide opportunities to share and exchange information, develop new skills, and get an overview of the workings of the entire network.

It is evident in each RAP's evaluation of these meetings that they are a very highly valued source for professional exchange among RAP staff. Repeated mention was made of the importance of new ideas, materials, techniques, and personnel for training that RAPs gained at the meetings. Several participants felt they had learned useful skills by participating in training sessions offered (e.g., in computer use) and through their involvement in the national task force meetings which convened there.

In addition to their educational function, the meetings were a strong renewing and motivating force for RAPs. RAPs commented that the peer contact made possible by these meetings was stimulating, "a morale boost," and helped maintain the high quality of RAP materials and services because they provided a comparative contect for self evaluation.

Having all members meet together on a regular basis was felt to be "indispensible" in fostering a cohesive network with particular priorities, direction, and continuity. New information and national perspectives gained at the meetings were important to RAP's planning for themselves and their grantees and increased their credibility with program staff. The national meetings also facilitated recognition of common problems and provided and immediate and continuing basis for problem solving.

Despite their appreciation for all the benefits obtained via the national meetings, RAPs did have suggestions for ways of improving them. Scheduling of the fall conference continues to be problematic; though it was held much earlier this year, it still interfered with training plans at two RAPs. RAPs suggested that having long advance notice of the meeting date might help avoid the problem. RAPs also strongly recommended more breaks, changes in format, and shorter sessions. Agendas were long and too packed with information to digest it all at once. There were continuing requests for some means of enabling all RAP staff to attend, for concurrent sessions to be eliminated, for task force meetings to be made a part of the regular schedule, and for copies of handouts to be available to each participant.

RAPs also seem to feel ready for more depth and substance in the meetings. Several suggested that professionals from outside the network be brought in to present a fresh perspective and that they be given enough time to go into their topic in some detail. There was also positive response to the format of the RAP sharing time in San Diego. RAPs felt more was gained by allowing each RAP to decide in advance whether they had something important to share and then allotting each a significant amount of time to present it properly.

11.

HEAD START ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

ACYF requires RAP staff to attend at least one state or regional Head Start directors' association meeting each year. The intent of such contact is to promote directors' awareness of RAPs as a program resource, to help build relationships between the RAPs and grantees, and to facilitate the exchange of information, informal assessment of needs, and the planning and coordination of work.

Though they generally agree that their attendance at these meetings is of only moderate importance, all RAPs attended more than the required number of directors' meetings. (Mississippi attended one state meeting but also four subcommittee meetings). Collectively, RAP staff were present at 75 state and 11 regional directors' meetings; the average number of meetings each RAP attended was around six though Texas Tech attended 15.

There appears to be considerable agreement among RAPs that their presence at directors' meetings does serve the purposes ACYF intended. Eight RAPs stated that these meetings helped them develop personal relationships with directors and gave them a chance to encourage programs' use of the resources and assistance available at RAP. Nine RAPs used the meetings as an opportunity to provide information, new materials, a review of current RAP work, and local or national news. Occasionally RAPs provided a formal training session or on-the-spot technical assistance at these meetings. Through directors' meetings RAPs also kept abreast of programs' changing needs, a function seven RAPs mentioned.

Other benefits of RAPs' attendance included the opportunity to plan training and assistance and to work out scheduling jointly with program personnel. One RAP (Region VII) has informal evaluation discussions with directors at their meetings to provide ongoing assessment of RAP's effectiveness in meeting their program's needs. In the case of Alaska, the Head Start Directors' Association was the vehicle through which RAP received state matching funds to support its early childhood coordinator.

12.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Each RAP is charged with responsibility for forming its own advisory committee, to be composed of at least one ACYF Regional Office representative, one Head Start director, and one parent of a handicapped child in Head Start. ACYF suggests that inclusion of the following could also be beneficial: one representative of a local educational agency and one handicap coordinator. However, these and other possible committee members are included at each RAP's discretion. The function of an advisory committee is to consult with the RAP on general policies and procedures and to assist in planning, assessment, and evaluation.

Though RAPs mentioned more than ten purposes served by their advisory committees, they generally felt that this task was of minimal importance.

One of the benefits of advisory committee meetings most frequently mentioned by RAPs was that meetings provided a forum for members from different states, different types of programs, different interest groups, and different staff levels within similar organizations to communicate needs, resources, and experiences with one another. Meetings also familiarized members with Head Start and RAP services and promoted collaboration between RAP and other agencies, and among agencies. Many RAPs used these meetings as a source of ideas, resources, and sometimes personnel for training and other assistance they hope to provide their grantees.

Planning is another major focus of the meetings. In some cases the emphasis is on long range planning and setting goals and priorities; in others, representatives develop specific schedules and sequences of training or site visits. Advisory members also serve as formal or informal evaluators for many RAPs. They often review materials prepared for distribution, evaluate projected training plans based on their knowledge of program needs, and act as a sounding board for RAPs.

This past year the Texas Tech advisory committee served in a unique role. It became a task force to review proposed changes in the Region VI Handicap SAVI, and to help with the application for refunding of the Handicap Consortia.

For the first time in the last four years all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Micronesia have been represented in some fashion on RAP advisory committees. All RAPs included at least one SEA representative from their service area and most had an SEA representative from each state or territory. In all, RAPs reported that 45 SEA representatives were involved in advising RAPs, including three from Micronesian areas.

The average size of RAPs' advisory committees remained the same as last year's, 14. University of Denver RAP's committee was the largest with 20 members. Portland's committee had a low of nine members. This year two advisory committees, Nashville and Alaska, did not have Regional Office representation; Region X ACYF continues to have limited travel funds for Alaska and Region IV ACYF was invited to join Nashville's committee but chose not to do so. In addition, Los Angeles RAP did not have parent representation this year; all other RAPs did meet at least the minimum requirements for advisory committee composition.

Five RAPs (Region III, University of Illinois, University of Denver, Portland State University, and Alaska) had all required and all suggested members on their committees. Denver also included Head Start teachers. Portage RAP remained unique for having a representative from another RAP on its committee.

Each RAP held at least one advisory committee meeting in 1982-83 and the vast majority had two. Hawaii called separate meetings for each of the three major geographic areas it serves. Mississippi and Denver each met with their committee once this year.

13.

ANNUAL SURVEY OF HANDICAP SERVICES

Data are collected about the numbers and types of handicapped children enrolled in each Head Start program, types of services provided, and various program needs related to the handicapped effort. Based on information from the survey, The Annual Report on the Status of Handicapped Children in Head Start Programs is then prepared and submitted to Congress. Since RAPs were first assigned responsibility for providing assistance with the annual survey six years ago, most grantees have experienced less difficulty in filling it out. Overall, RAPs rate this task of minimal importance; however, they continue to offer general assistance and answer specific questions as needed. Items that continue to be problematic for grantees include categorizing multiply handicapped children and ways of counting children. During 1982-83, seven of the 15 RAPs provided some means of reviewing the survey and orienting grantees to new items or changes. Six of these RAPs held discussions at meetings or conferences, usually with program directors or handicap coordinators. One RAP distributed draft copies of the survey to all directors and handicap coordinators and one RAP did a combination of the two.

Four RAPs reported providing technical assistance or clarification on specific questions on the survey.

NYU gave a presentation on the findings from the survey for the Regional ACYF Office and also sent a letter to New Jersey grantees (New Jersey handicapped enrollment averaged 8.56 percent the previous year) regarding recruitment and the need to include 10 percent handicapped children in local enrollment. Chapel Hill plans to review record keeping procedures at their orientation conference this Fall. At their mainstreaming conferences, Texas Tech offered a session to assist grantees in completing the survey.

Beginning in 1981-1982, the Annual Survey of Head Start Handicap Efforts was combined into the end of year annual Head Start Program Information Report (PIR). Forms are mailed out to Head Start programs in the spring to be completed by mid-June for the entire program operating year.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Overall

Data from interviews and records at RAP sites and information from RAP clientele demonstrate that this was a solid year for RAP. Satisfaction from three sources--Head Starts, SEAs, and trainees--increased or remained the same.

State Training Conferences

This year 15,407 participants were trained at 163 conferences. The majority of these continue to be Head Start teaching staff (67%). Thirty-eight percent of all Head Start teachers in the country were trained (6,716) and 23 percent of all teacher aides (3,714). Other Head Start staff trained numbered 4,977. The numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff are the highest ever trained by the network. Eighty-seven percent of the grantees attended the mainstreaming conferences.

This was the fifth year of wide-scale training on the mainstreaming concepts. Over five years a total of 62,520 persons have been trained at mainstreaming conferences or their equivalents.

Data from conference evaluations further corroborate attendance patterns. Classroom staff accounted for 64 percent of the trainees. Ninety-seven percent of the sampled conference trainees were Head Start staff.

Forty-six percent of the trainees had attended RAP mainstreaming conferences in the past.

Ninety-six percent of the sampled conference trainees rated conferences as "excellent" or "good." The typical trainee expected to change three to four practices as a result of the training.

Three to six months after the training, participants sampled in a follow-up interview said they had adopted an average of 3.7 practices as a result of the training.

Budget

The budget for the 1982-83 contract year totaled $2,317,395, increasing the total program budget by 8.2 percent. The budget supported 15 projects and moderate cost of living increases in salaries.

Individual RAP budgets averaged $154,493, compared to $142,741 last year. Budgets ranged from $126,531 to $219,137.

Salaries accounted for 58 percent of new monies. Increases this year in the salary line supported higher wages rather than more staff. Average salary per FTE was $19,785.

Generally, costs were contained by a contracting procedure which required RAP contractors to submit three year proposals for FY'81 through FY'83. The government picked up its option this year, FY'83, at the cost which had been submitted and negotiated previously.

Task Priorities

For the sixth year the network profile surfaced the same four tasks in top positions (services to Head Start grantees, state training conferences, needs assessments, and collaboration). Assistance with the annual survey again ranked last. Other tasks shifted within the middle positions.

Services To Head Start Grantees

The network recorded 4,107 activities (records of events or transactions initiated by a Head Start, RAP or another requestor) during the first eight and one-half months of the program year, an increase of 14 percent from the previous year. The volume exceeds all years, save one, and more than quadruples the level of the first year. On the average each RAP responds to 32 requests per month.

RAPs are the providers of service in 95 percent of the activities. Other providers are regional office contractors or the regional office, an individual or agency, or another RAP.

Seventy-five percent of the requestors are Head Start staff, primarily persons responsible for coordinating handicap services, followed by teachers, directors, and other administrators. This is a one percent increase over last year. Other requests come from resource providers, ACYF national and regional offices and their contractors, SEAs, LEAs, and others.

Activities characterized by type fall into the following distribution: 61 percent materials, 25 percent information, 10 percent technical assistance, 4 percent training. The percentage of change within categories compared to last year is insignificant.

In the first eight and one-half months of the program year a total of 1,098 tasks records (labor and time intensive activities which relate to RAP tasks) were recorded, an increase of 8 percent over the previous reporting period, and an average of 73 per RAP, up from 68 last year.

A total of 214 training sessions were delivered on-site during the eight and one-half month reporting period, in addition to mainstreaming conferences.

Needs Assessments

RAPs had assessed the handicap needs of 97 percent of all Head Start grantees, compared to 93 percent last year.

Most frequently cited as a major need this year was assistance on managing difficult behavior in a classroom setting. Training on IEPs fell to second in priority. Many RAPs also noted that grantees continued to want more assistance in working with parents and families of handicapped children, and with the following handicapping conditions: emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, speech and language, and health impairments.

Collaboration

This year RAPs were involved in the following collaborative activities: SEA/Head Start agreements; other SEA/Head Start collaboration; LEA/Head Start collaboration; and facilitation with other agencies serving handicapped preschoolers.

Six new SEA agreements were signed this year, two of which were between SEAs and ACYF. The total number of SEA/Head Start agreements reported by RAP is 36.

Twelve signed, local agreements between a Head Start program and local education agency were directly facilitated by RAP.

Management Information System

RAPs have a fully operational computerized MIS. All 15 RAPs operate with the Apple III hardware and software, and the RAPPLE software program, which was completed this year.

RAPPLE consists of five separate programs: agencies (Head Start/non-Head Start) program, provider program, resource program, activity program, and task program. Information may be manipulated by using the following functions: enter, edit and select; the data base may be printed. The tally function is only partially completed.

All RAPs have entered all Head Starts into the agency data base. Thirteen RAPs have entered some activities. Ten RAPs have entered some task records. Ten RAPs have entered some providers. Nine have entered some resources. Six have made some entries in every category.

National RAP Meetings

Two national RAP meetings were convened this year. The first was held in Seattle, Washington in August 1982; the second was held in San Diego, California in February 1983.

Head Start Directors' Meetings

RAP staff attended 75 state meetings and 11 regional meetings of Head Start Associations.

Resource Provider File

A total of 6,914 entries, including agencies, individuals and materials resources are catalogued by the RAP network for use by Head Starts. This represents an increase of 110 over the total reported last year.

Of the total number of resources catalogued network-wide, RAPs reported that 570 are used actively, an average of 38 per RAP.

RAP Task Forces

Five task forces were operational during 1982-1983. The computer task force was continued from the previous year, the PA26 and language development task forces were reinstituted, and two new ones emerged: child abuse and neglect, and innovative approaches to increasing enrollment of severely handicapped children in Head Start.

Each RAP was assigned to one, and in some cases, two, three or four task forces.

Advisory Committees

In 1982-83, the average RAP advisory committee had 14 members, the same number as last year. Size of the committees ranged from nine to 20 members.

All but three RAPs met the minimum contract requirements for representation on their advisory committee.

SEA representation on advisory committees has increased since a year ago, from 40 to 45 states and territories. Seventy-nine percent of all SEAs are members. Four RAP advisory committees had representatives from LEAs.

Annual Survey

RAPs received few specific requests for assistance with the annual survey of handicapped children in Head Start. Most RAPs had informed grantees of their availability for assistance and encouraged programs to collect data early to expedite filling out the forms.

Head Start Telephone Survey

Telephone interviews were held with 386 Head Start programs to assess the impact of RAP services.

The overall satisfaction score was 3.4 on a 4 point scale, identical to last year. Ninety-four percent reported no problems with RAP.

The average number of types of contact between RAPs and Head Starts was 4.2, down from 4.6 last year. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated contact was mutually initiated.

Attendance at mainstreaming conferences was the most frequently cited type of contact; data from the Head Start telephone survey verify the above findings: 29 percent of the sampled teachers were trained at mainstreaming conferences and 22 percent of all teacher aides; 86 percent of the sampled grantees attended.

Training was most commonly cited as RAP's most valuable service, followed by distribution of materials, and information.

SEA Perception of RAP Services

SEAs or their counterparts were contacted in 46 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Pacific Trust Territory, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Overall satisfaction with RAPs' performance was 3.5 on a four point scale, a slight increase from 3.3 in 1981-82. Ninety-eight percent reported no problems in their dealings with RAP.

The average number of types of contact was 4.0, down slightly from the previous year. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that contacts are mutually initiated; two SEAs reported there had been no contact initiated by RAP during the last year.

Information exchange was the most frequently cited type of contact between RAPs and SEAs (91%); 70 percent indicated RAP and the SEA had attended or presented at each others' meetings, workshops or conferences, or had co-sponsored them.

Recommendations

Administration

Many of the recommendations set forth will be remedied by the presence of a project officer taking a leadership position. For almost two years RAPs have been administered by an acting project officer. At the writing of this report ACYF has appointed a project officer for the network.

Mainstreaming Conferences

Although the RAP projects have been very successful in conducting the mainstreaming conferences, each RAP must redesign the training it delivers each year, resulting in a great variety of subjects and duplicated staff time across the network. The evaluators have found that

RAP mainstreaming conferences developed around a single theme are well received and satisfying for RAP staff to deliver. We recommend that ACYF endorse a unified training package for use by the RAP network and allocate funds to develop and duplicate the package.

- A list of mainstreaming conferences should be submitted to the RAP Project Officer by December 1, 1983.

- Although nationally a large percentage of Head Start grantees (87%) attended mainstreaming conferences, a significant percentage were absent from conferences conducted by a few RAPs. The reasons for most of these absences are unknown by the RAPs. We recommend that RAPs determine the causes of absence at conferences in order to increase the rate of participation among their grantees.

Collaboration

ACYF continues to be very interested in obtaining information on collaborative efforts between Head Start and other agencies, particularly state and local education agencies. ACYF must clarify their expectations with regard to the type of information it seeks from the RAP network at the start of the program year.

The evaluators have identified the following questions which require definition for a collaborative agreement:

- Signing parties of SEA Agreements - Must the ACYF Regional Office be a signer of an SEA agreement? Is an agreement counted if a regional office contractor signs in place of ACYF or Head Start?

- Content of LEA Agreements - Must an agreement between a school system and a Head Start program identify services to handicapped children, or is any exchange of services enough to qualify the agreement for inclusion in a tally?

- Signers of LEA Agreements - When services are exchanged in the absence of a written agreement, must there be a written or signed document, or both, in order for the agreement to be counted in a tally?

Task Forces

When assigning members to a new task force, ACYF should issue in writing the name of the task force, the chair, the individual members, the purpose of the task force, the objectives or products and the expected time for delivery.

When a task force becomes defunct, ACYF should notify the chairperson in writing.

ACYF should distribute the burden of task force participation evenly among RAPs. Some RAPs are members of up to four task forces. One RAP chairs two task forces.

All task force meetings, additional to those at national RAP meetings, should receive approval of the ACYF project officer.

ACYF must allow funds for task force meetings that take place in addition to those at national RAP meetings.

Management Information System

Now that the RAPPLE system has been implemented at each RAP, it is imperative that the data base has identical application at each RAP. ACYF should monitor the implementation of the system.

Further clarification is needed in the definition of the categories of training versus meetings in recording task records.

National RAP Meetings

ACYF should poll RAPs prior to a meeting to obtain suggestions from them about the content and format.

THE NEW ENGLAND RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02160
Telephone:	(617) 969-7100
Funding Sponsor:	Education Development Center (EDC)
Staff:	Joanne Brady, Director Kirsten Hansen, Assistant Director Nancy Railsback, Coordinator

Funding Level: $142,502; national average $154,493; rank: 10.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.5; national average 3.5; rank: 7.

FTE Salary: $18,821; national average $19,785; rank: 11.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont --- 67,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fourth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 74; national average 72; rank: 8.

FTE per Head Start: 21; national average 21; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 2,181; national average 3,122; rank: 11.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 623; national average 892; rank: 10.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 1,500; national average 2,257; rank: 10.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 95 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- how to work with public schools; implement IEPs; how to collaborate with agencies serving handicapped children.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

7 conferences were held, national average 11. 419 teaching staff were trained, representing 50 percent of the teachers and 8 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 309 others were in attendance. 728 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank 9. 71 grantees attended, representing 96 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

100 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
43 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
16 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
41 percent others, 32 percent nationally
0 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
53 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
45 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
2 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.0 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

208 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
70 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

243 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	14	10
Information	20	25
Materials	65	61

Provider:
RAP 96 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 3 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:
Head Start 81 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 19 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: manuals, collaboration, Head Start policy/regulations, staff management/development.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Connecticut	30
Maine	9
Massachusetts	27
New Hampshire	13
Rhode Island	11
Vermont	7
Other	3

Task Records:

93 recorded, 73 national average.
28 task records were recorded on training; 512 were trained at 28 sessions, including 148 teachers, 83 teacher aides, 273 others, 8 non-Head Start, and 0 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings were held; 19 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

Computer (chair)
PA26
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start.

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended, plus 2 regional meetings.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - none

Head Start Telepone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 7 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 40 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 90 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 66 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP:4.8, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 3.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	School of Continuing Education 3 Washington Square Village, Suite 1M New York, New York 10012
Telephone:	(212) 598-2144
Funding Sponsor:	New York University
Staff:	Judith Rothschild-Stolberg, Director Dinah Heller, Coordinator Michelle Rutman, Resource Specialist Klaudia Rivera, Resource Specialist Robert Daniels, Social Service Coordinator

Funding Level: $181,658; national average $154,493; rank: 2.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.3; national average 3.5; rank: 9.

FTE Salary: $ 22,349; national average $19,785; rank: 4.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, --- 61,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; third smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 81; national average 72; rank: 7.

FTE per Head Start: 25; national average 21; rank: 4.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 4,422; national average 3,122; rank: 4.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,340; national average 892; rank: 3.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 4,006; national average 2,257; rank: 1.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Establish/update file of resource providers
Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 94 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- information on specific handicapping conditions, providing linkage with other resources, working with LEAs, abuse and neglect, screening, assessment, IEPs, working with parents, behavior problems, hyperactivity, disruptive child.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

9 conferences were held, national average 11. 845 teaching staff were trained, representing 28 percent of the teachers and 14 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 835 others were in attendance. 1,680 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank 2. 80 grantees attended, representing 98 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
35 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
14 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
50 percent others, 32 percent nationally
0 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
50 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
41 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
6 percent somereservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.6 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

459 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
45 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

360 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	14	10
Information	16	25
Materials	69	61

Provider:

RAP 99 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 1 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 84 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 16 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, health impairment, collaboration, legislation/regulations.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
New Jersey	23
New York	71
Puerto Rico	2
Virgin Islands	1
Other	3

Task Records:

79 recorded, 73 national average. 13 task records were recorded on training; 441 were trained at 13 sessions, including 32 teachers, 0 teacher aides, 270 others, 0 non-Head Start, and 139 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held; 13 members, 14 national average; Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

Language Development (chair)
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start (chair)
Computer

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:
- Head Start grantees - all
- Activities - none
- Task Records - none
- Providers - some
- Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.7, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 4 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 21 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 100 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 75 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.5, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE REGION III RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Georgetown University Child Development Center
CG-52 Bles Building
3800 Reservoir Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
Telephone: (202) 625-3639
Funding Sponsor: Georgetown University Child Development Center
Staff: Phyllis Magrab, Director
Virginia Williams, Associate Director
Stanley Pryor, Coordinator
Roxane Kaufmann, Associate Coordinator
Diane Jacobstein, Information Specialist
Nina Newman, Training Specialist

Funding Level: $149,601; national average $154,493; rank: 7.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.6; national average 3.5; rank: 11.

FTE Salary: $28,240; national average $19,785; rank: 1.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, D.C., West Virginia --- 123,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fifth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 118; national average 72; rank: 2.

FTE per Head Start: 45; national average 21; rank: 2.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 4,879; national average 3,122; rank: 3.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,877; national average 892; rank: 1.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,142; national average 2,257; rank: 6.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Participate on RAP task forces

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Attend National RAP meetings
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 97 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- severe and profound handicaps, behavior management, warning signs (of handicapping conditions).

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

11 conferences were held, national average 11. 1,387 teaching staff were trained, representing 57 percent of the teachers and 30 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 268 others were in attendance 1,655 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank 3. 112 grantees attended, representing 95 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
46 percent of teachers, 42 percent nationally
22 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
30 percent others, 32 percent nationally
2 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
56 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
44 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
0 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.8 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

800 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
60 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

451 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	9	4
TA	7	10
Information	16	25
Materials	68	61

Provider:

RAP 100 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 1 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 73 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 27 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, collaboration, mainstreaming, teaching methods.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Delaware	3
District of Columbia	8
Maryland	35
Pennsylvania	22
Virginia	18
West Virginia	5
Other	9

Task Records:

80 recorded, 73 national average. 30 task records were recorded on training; 906 were trained at 30 sessions, including 307 teachers, 141 teacher aides, 221 others, 237 non-Head Start, and 0 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 12 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required and suggested representatives.

Task Force Membership:

Child Abuse and Neglect (chair)

Head Start Directors Meetings:

4 meetings was attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - none
Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.2 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.3, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 17 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 25 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 77 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 60 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.6, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.8 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE CHAPEL HILL RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Chapel Hill Training-Outreach Project Lincoln Center, Merritt Mill Road Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
Telephone:	(919) 967-8295
Funding Sponsor:	Carboro School District
Staff:	Anne Sanford, Director Patricia Mengel, Coordinator Brenda Bowen, Associate Coordinator Melissa Cole, Associate Coordinator

Funding Level: $149,128; national average $154,493; rank: 8.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.4; national average 3.5; rank: 8.

FTE Salary: $19,957; national average $19,785; rank: 7.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina --- 191,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; seventh largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 112; national average 72; rank: 4.

FTE per Head Start: 33; national average 21; rank: 3.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 4,373; national average 3,122; rank: 5.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,286; national average 892; rank: 4.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,483; national average 2,257; rank: 4.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Attend Head Start association meetings
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 90 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- behavior management, classroom management, homebased Head Start, transition, specific handicapping conditions (orthopedic,health).

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

9 conferences were held, national average 11. 555 teaching staff were trained, representing 22 percent of the teachers and 10 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 358 others were in attendance. 913 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 8. 99 grantees attended, representing 88 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

87 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
38 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
21 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
29 percent others, 32 percent nationally
9 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
62 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
35 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
2 percent some reservations 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.6 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

600 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
50 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

444 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	5	10
Information	26	25
Materials	68	61

Provider:

RAP 99 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 1 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 64 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 36 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming, mainstreaming manuals, staff management/development, child abuse.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Florida	13
Georgia	15
North Carolina	27
South Carolina	10
Other	35

Task Records:

70 recorded, 73 national average. 9 task records were recorded on training; 235 were trained at 9 sessions, including 0 teachers, 0 teacher aides, 75 others, 25 non-Head Start, and 135 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 11 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

Computer
PA26
Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

2 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - none
Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.8, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 21 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 90 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 66 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.8, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.8 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE NASHVILLE RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Peabody College of Vanderbilt University Post Office Box 317 Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Telephone:	(615) 322-8474
Funding Sponsor:	The Urban Observatory of Metropolitan Nashville-University Center
Staff:	Joseph Cunningham, Director Sharon Innes, Assistant Director Marsha Crownover, Training Coordinator Deborah Hill, Training Coordinator

Funding Level: $133,103; national average $154,493; rank: 14.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.9; national average 3.5, rank: 5.

FTE Salary: $15,477; national average $19,785; rank: 14.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, --- 132,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; sixth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 84; national average 72; rank: 6.

FTE per Head Start: 22; national average 21; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,518; national average 3,122; rank 7.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 902; national average 892; rank: 7.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,723; national average 2,257; rank: 8.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Attend Head Start Association meetings
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent, greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- speech and language skills, specific handicapping condition (learning disabilities), stress and job burnout, behavior management, working with parents, child abuse.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

8 conferences were held, national average 11. 386 teaching staff were trained, representing 18 percent of the teachers and 10 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 195 others were in attendance 581 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 11. 61 grantees attended, representing 73 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
51 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
21 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
28 percent others, 32 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
61 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
37 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
2 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.0 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

240 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
40 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

201 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	3	10
Information	39	25
Materials	58	61

Provider:

RAP 98 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 3 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 76 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 24 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, collaboration, speech/language, orthopedic, Head Start policy/regulations.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Alabama	23
Kentucky	24
Tennessee	43
Other	10

Task Records:

82 recorded, 73 national average. 23 task records were recorded on training; 595 were trained at 23 sessions, including 115 teachers, 31 teacher aides, 126 others, 0 non-Head Start, and 323 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 14 members, 14 national average. Membership includes two of the required representatives (it does not include an ACYF/RO representative). Membership also includes two suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

PA26
Language Development

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - all
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.5, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 25 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 73 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 60 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.3, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.7 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE MISSISSIPPI RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Friends of Children of Mississippi, Inc. 119 Mayes Street Jackson, Mississippi 39213
Telephone:	(601) 362-1541
Funding Sponsor:	Chapel Hill Outreach Project subcontracted to the Friends of Children Head Start
Staff:	Anne Sanford, Director Valerie Campbell, Coordinator Juanita McLeod, Assistant Coordinator

Funding Level: $126,531; national average $154, 493; rank: 15.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.8; national average 3.5; rank: 6.

FTE Salary: $17,465; national average $19,785; rank: 12.

REGIONAL SITUATION

State Served: Mississippi, --- 48,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; second smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 23; national average 72; rank: 13.

FTE per Head Start: 6; national average 21; rank: 11.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 2,923; national average 3,122; rank: 9.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 769; national average 892; rank: 8.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,750; national average 2,257; rank: 7.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Establish/update file of resource providers
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Implement management information system

Task identified as having minimal importance:

Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- specific handicapping conditions (learning disabilities, speech impairments, emotional disturbance), getting and keeping volunteers, teacher self esteem.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

6 conferences were held, national average 11. 428 teaching staff were trained, representing 17 percent of the teachers and 14 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 509 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 13. 20 grantees attended, representing 87 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

100 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
58 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
34 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
9 percent others, 32 percent nationally
0 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
69 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
29 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
1 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 4.9 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

250 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
53 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

187 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	7	10
Information	17	25
Materials	76	61

Provider:

RAP 100 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 0 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 76 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 24 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, mainstreaming, speech/language, curriculum, Head Start policy/regulations.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Mississippi	94
Other	6

Task Records:

75 recorded, 73 national average. 6 task records were recorded on training; 426 were trained at 6 sessions, including 126 teachers, 0 teacher aides, 0 others, 0 non-Head Start, and 300 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held. 14 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

1 meeting was attended, plus 4 sub-committee meetings.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.8 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.1, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 21 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 87 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 83 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.0, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Colonel Wolfe School 403 East Healey Champaign, Illinois 61820
Telephone:	(217) 333-3876
Funding Sponsor:	University of Illinois
Staff:	Merle Karnes, Director Dennis Sykes, Coordinator Deborah Herron, Resource Specialist Rex Roberts, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $134,149; national average $154,493; rank: 13.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 5.3; national average 3.5; rank: 1.

FTE Salary: $14,145; national average $19,785; rank: 15.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, --- 132,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; sixth smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 114; national average 72; rank: 3.

FTE per Head Start: 22; national average 21; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 6,078; national average 3,122; rank: 1.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,147; national average 892; rank: 5.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,400; national average 2,257; rank: 5.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Attend National RAP meetings
Participate on RAP task forces
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 73 percent completed, national average 97 percent, greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- collaboration (with public schools and other agencies), developing and implementing IEPs/ISPs, working with families, speech and language, child abuse.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

15 conferences were held, national average 11. 1,013 teaching staff were trained, representing 32 percent of the teachers and 27 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 625 others were in attendance. 1,638 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 4. 73 grantees attended, representing 64 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
38 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
24 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
36 percent others, 32 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average.
34 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
54 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
8 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
1 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.7 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

216 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
12 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

242 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	10	10
Information	22	25
Materials	67	61

Provider:

RAP 98 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 4 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 75 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 25 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: administrative planning, Head Start policy/regulations, screening, gifted/talented.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Illinois	42
Indiana	17
Ohio	34
Other	7

Task Records:

50 recorded, 73 national average. 5 task records were recorded on training; 144 were trained at 5 sessions, including 11 teachers, 4 teacher aides, 37 others, 25 non-Head Start, and 67 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 12 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required and all suggested representatives.

Task Force Membership:

Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

2 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 2.6, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 3 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 56 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 48 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 55 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 5.0, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 3.7 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE PORTAGE RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Portage Project
626 Slifer Street
Box 564
Portage, Wisconsin 53901
Telephone: (608) 742-8811
Funding Sponsor: CESA 12
Staff: Neil Schortinghuis, Director
Mary Egan, Resource Specialist
Linda Young, Resource Specialist
Julia Herwig, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $154,448; national average $154,493; rank: 5.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.5; national average 3.5; rank: 3.

FTE Salary: $18,834; national average $19,785; rank: 10.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, --- 190,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; seventh smallest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 85; national average 72; rank: 5.

FTE per Head Start: 19; national average 21; rank: 8.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,428; national average 3,122; rank: 8.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 762; national average 892; rank: 9.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 2,170; national average 2,257; rank: 9.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Attend National RAP meetings

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- working with parents, collaboration with LEAs, use of PA26 money, staff management, child abuse and neglect, general information on RAP, specific handicapping conditions (learning disabilities, emotional disturbance).

Mainstreaming Training Conferences: 9 conferences were held, national average 11. 845 teaching staff were trained, representing 44 percent of the teachers and 34 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 356 others were in attendance. 1,201 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 6. 81 grantees attended, representing 95 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
39 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
23 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
36 percent others, 32 percent nationally
2 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
50 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
45 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
3 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.5 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

375 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
20 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

258 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	2	4
TA	13	10
Information	28	25
Materials	57	61

Provider:

RAP 98 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 2 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 74 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 26 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: Head Start policy/regulation, mainstreaming, speech/language, collaboration, mainstreaming manuals.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Michigan	26
Minnesota	26
Wisconsin	33
Other	8

Task Records:

92 recorded, 73 national average. 11 task records were recorded on training; 248 were trained at 11 sessions, including 0 teachers, 0 teacher aides, 31 others, 0 non-Head Start, and 217 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 17 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative). Membership also includes another RAP.

Task Force Membership:

PA26
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

8 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.0, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 7 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 33 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 83 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 50 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.5, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 3.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Texas Tech University
Institute for Child and Family Studies
Post Office Box 4170
Lubbock, Texas 79409
Telephone: (806) 742-3104
Funding Sponsor: Texas Tech University
Staff: Mary Tom Riley, Director
James Mitchell, Coordinator
Margaret Luera, Coordinator

Funding Level: $140,768; national average $154,493; rank: 12.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.0; national average 3.5; rank: 10.

FTE Salary: $22,098; national average $19,785; rank: 5.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, --- 561,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; second largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 140; national average 72; rank: 1.

FTE per Head Start: 47; national average 21; rank: 1.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 5,496; national average 3,122; rank: 2.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,832; national average 892; rank: 2.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,621; national average 2,257; rank: 3.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Implement Management Information System
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Tasks identified as having mimimal importance:

Establish/update file of resource providers
Conduct Advisory Committee

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- specific handicapping conditions (speech impairment, health impairments, emotional disturbance), help with PIR, implementing IEPs, behavior management, child abuse and neglect, social services training as it relates to the handicap component, PA26 expenditures, nutrition information.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

15 conferences were held, national average 11. 2,024 teaching staff were trained, representing 67 percent of the teachers and 44 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 413 others were in attendance. 2,437 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 1. 111 grantees attended, representing 79 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
43 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
33 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
23 percent others, 32 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
55 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
41 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
2 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 4.2 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

1,270 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
35 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

532 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	20	4
TA	10	10
Information	17	25
Materials	53	61

Provider:

RAP 76 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 24 percent, nationally 5 percent.
*Project LATON provided the training for 126 requests for on-site training, accounting for the 24 percent in the "other" provider category.

Requestor:

Head Start 97 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 3 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: working with parents, mainstreaming manuals, Head Start policy/regulations, screening.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Arkansas	9
Louisiana	19
New Mexico	13
Oklahoma	18
Texas	38
Other	3

Task Records:

87 recorded, 73 national average. 18 task records were recorded on training; 840 was trained at 18 sessions, including 194 teachers, 149 teacher aides, 220 others, 47 non-Head Start, and 230 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 14 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

PA26
Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

15 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Provider:

RAP 76 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 24 percent, nationally 5 percent.
*Project LATON provided the training for 126 requests for on-site training, accounting for the 24 percent in the "other" provider category.

Requestor:

Head Start 97 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 3 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: working with parents, mainstreaming manuals, Head Start policy/regulations, screening.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Arkansas	9
Louisiana	19
New Mexico	13
Oklahoma	18
Texas	38
Other	3

Task Records:

87 recorded, 73 national average. 18 task records were recorded on training; 840 was trained at 18 sessions, including 194 teachers, 149 teacher aides, 220 others, 47 non-Head Start, and 230 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 14 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

PA26
Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

15 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.1, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 30 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 79 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 69 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.9 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.3, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE REGION VII RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	University of Kansas Medical Center 39th and Rainbow Boulevard, CRU, Room 26 Kansas City, Kansas 66103
Telephone:	(913) 588-5961
Funding Sponsor:	University of Kansas
Staff:	Richard Whelan, Director Glen Ridnour, Co-Director Carol Dermyer, Coordinator BethAnn Smith, Coordinator Marilyn Shankland, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $141,811; national average $154,493; rank: 11.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.0; national average 3.5; rank: 4.

FTE Salary: $19,204; national average $19,785; rank: 9.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, -- 285,00 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; fifth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 67; national average 72; rank: 9.

FTE per Head Start: 17; national average 21; rank: 9.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 2,455; national average 3,122; rank: 10.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 614; national average 892; rank: 11.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 1,053; national average 2,257; rank: 11.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Attend Head Start association meetings
Attend National RAP meetings

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Establish/update file of resource providers
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average: 97 percent, greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- working with parents, integrating IEPs into daily planning, behavior management.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

17 conferences were held, national average 11. 909 teaching staff were trained, representing 89 percent of the teachers and 83 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 560 others were in attendance. 1,469 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 5. 66 grantees attended, representing 99 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

93 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
32 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
28 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
32 percent others, 32 percent nationally
6 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
54 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
45 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
1 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.5 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

612 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
25 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

298 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532.

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	7	10
Information	21	25
Materials	72	61

Provider:

RAP 99 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 1 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 85 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 15 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, curriculum, mainstreaming, Head Start policy/regulations.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Iowa	31
Kansas	14
Missouri	41
Nebraska	9
Other	5

Task Records:

58 recorded, 73 national average. 7 task records were recorded on training; 155 were trained at 7 sessions, including 68 teachers, 33 teacher aides, 51 others, 3 non-Head Start, and 0 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held. 12 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives and two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

PA26 (chair)
Computer

Head Start Directors Meetings:

8 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - none
Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.6, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 3 percent of respondents 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 65 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 93 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 45 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.8, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 3.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.3.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: Denver Research Institute-SSRE
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80208
Telephone: (303) 753-3484
Funding Sponsor: University of Denver
Staff: Jane Amundson, Director
Becky Cook, Coordinator
Annette Sherman, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $164,918; national average $154,493; rank: 4.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.6; national average 3.5; rank: 11.

FTE Salary: $22,848; national average $19,785; rank: 3.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, --- 574,000 square miles, national average 239,000 square miles; third largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 54; national average 72; rank: 11.

FTE per Head Start: 21; national average 21; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 1,326; national average 3,122; rank: 13.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 510; national average 892; rank: 13.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 885 national average 2,257; rank: 12.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Implement management information system

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Conduct Advisory Committee
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent, greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- working with families, behavior management, specific handicapping conditions (learning disabilities, emotional disturbance), IEPs.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

23 conferences were held, national average 11. 435 teaching staff were trained, representing 55 percent of the teachers and 43 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 276 others were in attendance. 711 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 10. 49 grantees attended, representing 91 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

97 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
- 33 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
- 22 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
- 41 percent others, 32 percent nationally

3 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
- 59 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
- 40 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
- 2 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
- 0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.4 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

152 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
30 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

207 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	8	10
Information	15	25
Materials	76	61

Provider:

RAP 97 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 4 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 82 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 18 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: mainstreaming manuals, mainstreaming, hearing impairment, assessment.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Colorado	36
Montana	11
North Dakota	4
South Dakota	9
Utah	21
Wyoming	14
Other	5

Task Records:

64 recorded, 73 national average. 2 task records were recorded on training; 2 were trained at 2 sessions, including 1 teacher, 0 teacher aides, 1 other , 0 non-Head Start, and 0 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

1 meeting held. 20 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required and all suggested representatives. It also includes Head Start teachers.

Task Force Membership:

Computer
Language Development
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Child in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

7 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - none
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.6, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 7 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 47 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 97 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 47 of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.8, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.5 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE LOS ANGELES RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: 1741 Silverlake Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90026
Telephone: (213) 664-2937
Funding Sponsor: Child, Youth and Family Services (CYFS)
Staff: Beatrice Gold, Director
Chris Drouin, Co-Director
Joyce Williams, Coordinator
Joni Bell, Resource Specialist

Funding Level: $181,597; national average $164,493; rank: 3.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 3.5; national average 3.5; rank: 7.

FTE Salary: $22,079; national average $19,785; rank: 6.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Arizona, California, Nevada, --- 383,000 square miles; national average 239,000 square miles; fourth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 57; national average 72; rank: 10.

FTE per Head Start: 16; national average 21; rank: 10.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 3,917; national average 3,122; rank: 6.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 1,119; national average: 892; rank: 6.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 3,829; national average 2,257; rank: 2.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Attend national RAP meetings

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

None

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed, national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- administrative issues, how to fill out the PIR.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

12 conferences were held, national average 11. 575 teaching staff were trained, representing 21 percent of the teachers and 8 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 376 others were in attendance. 951 total trainees, national average 1,027; rank: 7. 55 grantees attended, representing 96 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

99 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
51 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
24 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
24 percent others, 32 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
54 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
42 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
2 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.7 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

402 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
10 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

174 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	37	10
Information	31	25
Materials	32	61

Provider:

RAP 100 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 6 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 76 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 24 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: collaboration, Head Start policy/regulation, administrative planning, legislation/regulation.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Arizona	4
California	87
Nevada	1
Other	6

Task Records:

71 recorded, 73 national average. 5 task records were recorded on training; 95 were trained at 5 sessions, including 49 teachers, 10 teacher aides, 13 others, 23 non-Head Start, and 0 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 16 members, 14 national average. Membership includes two of the required representatives (it does not include a parent representative). Membership also includes two of the suggested representatives (it does not include an LEA representative).

Task Force Membership:

Computer
PA26
Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

5 regional meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - none
Providers - all
Resources - none

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.3 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.6, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 20 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 10 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 93 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 67 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.7 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.7, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 3.3 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE PACIFIC RAP

BACKGROUND

Location: School of Public Health
University of Hawaii
Biomedical Science Bldg., C-105M
1960 East West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone: (808) 948-8639
Funding Sponsor: University of Hawaii
Staff: Setsu Furuno, Director
Eric Arveson, Coordinator
Shirley Salomon, Field Training Specialist
David Roscoe, Field Training Specialist
Georgianne Won, Resource Specialist
Francine McMurtry, Training Support Specialist

Funding Level: $219,137; national average $154,493; rank: 1.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 4.6; national average 3.5; rank: 2.

FTE Salary: $19,355; national average $19,785; rank: 8.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, Pacific Trust Territory, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, --- 7,500 square miles; national average 239,000 square miles; smallest geographic area, but spread over millions of square miles in the Pacific.

Number of Grantees: 13; national average 72; rank: 14.

FTE per Head Start: 3; national average 21; rank: 12.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 408; national average 3,122; rank: 14.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 87; national average 892; rank: 14.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 436; national average 2,257; rank: 14.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Establish/update file of resource providers
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed; national average 97 percent, greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- IEPs, recruitment, services for the hearing impaired.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

12 conferences were held, national average 11. 296 teaching staff were trained, representing 76 percent of the teachers and 51 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 75 others were in attendance. 371 total trainees; national average 1,027; rank: 14. 12 grantees attended, representing 92 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

95 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
49 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
31 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
14 percent others, 32 percent nationally
1 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.8 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
77 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
22 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
1 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 3.7 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

360 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
15 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

132 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	4	10
Information	33	25
Materials	63	61

Provider:

RAP 89 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 12 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 40 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 60 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: assessment, collaboration, screening, staff management/development.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Hawaii	67
Guam	5
CNMI	3
Pacific Trust Territory	19
Other	6

Task Records:

63 recorded, 73 national average. 16 task records were recorded on training; 284 were trained at 16 sessions, including 126 teachers, 50 teacher aides, 72 others, 5 non-Head Start, and 31 unidentified.

Advisory Committees:

3 meetings held (one in each of RAP's service areas). An average of 10 members for the 3 ACs, 14 national average. Membership includes all required representatives on one AC but does not include the parent representative on two. Membership also includes one of the suggested representatives but it does not include the handicap coordinator or LEA representatives (note: there are no LEAs in the RAP service areas).

Task Force Membership:

Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

4 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of March 1, 1983:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - none
Task Records - none
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.6 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 6.6, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 70 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 100 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 56 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.0, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale, national average 2.8.

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	Portland State University Post Office Box 1491 Portland, Oregon 97201
Telephone:	(503) 229-4815
Funding Sponsor:	Portland State University
Staff:	Carillon Olmsted, Director Mary Perkins, Coordinator

Funding Level: $144,364; national average $154,493; rank: 9.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.5; national average 3.5; rank: 12.

FTE Salary: $17,306; national average $19,785; rank: 13.

REGIONAL SITUATION

States Served: Idaho, Oregon, Washington, --- 249,000 square miles; national average 239,000 square miles; sixth largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 49; national average 72; rank: 12.

FTE per Head Start: 20; national average 21; rank: 7.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 1,349; national average 3,122; rank: 12.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 540; national average 892; rank: 12.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 773; national average 2,257; rank: 13.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Assess needs of Head Start grantees
Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Attend National RAP meetings

Task identified as having minimal importance:

Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed; national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- direct services for OT and PT in rural communities, interdisciplinary diagnostic teams.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

7 conferences were held, national average 11. 287 teaching staff were trained, representing 49 percent of the teachers and 22 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 238 others were in attendance. 525 total trainees; national average 1,027; rank: 12. 43 grantees attended, representing 88 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

98 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
46 percent teachers, 42 percent nationally
11 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
42 percent others, 32 percent nationally
2 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.4 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average
52 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
38 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
8 percent some reservations 3 percent nationally
2 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Respondents would adopt an average of 2.7 new practices as a consequence of training, compared to 3.4 nationally.

Resource Providers:

220 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
75 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

158 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	-	4
TA	12	10
Information	53	25
Materials	36	61

Provider:

RAP 100 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 2 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 65 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 35 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: staff management/development, collaboration, orthopedic handicaps, speech/language.

Geographic Distribution:

States	% of Activities
Idaho	11
Oregon	34
Washington	67
Other	12

Task Records:

74 recorded, 73 national average. 19 task records were recorded on training; 464 were trained at 19 sessions, including 83 teachers, 41 teacher aides, 128 others, 74 non-Head Start, and 133 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 9 members, 14 national average. Membership includes all required and suggested representatives.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect

Head Start Directors Meetings:

6 meetings were attended, plus 1 regional meeting.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 3.2 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 4.1, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 11 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 58 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 96 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 75 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 2.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.0, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 2.0 on a four point scale national average 2.8.

THE ALASKA RAP

BACKGROUND

Location:	1345 W. 9th Avenue, Suite 202 Anchorage, Alaska 99501
Telephone:	(907) 274-1665
Funding Sponsor:	Easter Seal Society
Staff:	Marion Bowles, Director Sharon Fortier, Co-Coordinator Hilary Hardwick, Co-Coordinator Jill Duthie, Speech Pathologist

Funding Level: $153,680; national average $154,493; rank: 6.

Full-Time Equivalent Staff: 2.6; national average 3.5; rank: 11.

FTE Salary: $27,368; national average $19,785; rank: 2.

REGIONAL SITUATION

State Served: Alaska, --- 586,000 square miles; national average 239,000 square miles; largest geographic area.

Number of Grantees: 3; national average 72; rank: 15.

FTE per Head Start: 1; national average 21; rank: 13.

Estimated Number of Head Start Handicapped Children: 84; national average 3,122; rank: 15.

FTE per Handicapped Child: 32; national average 892; rank: 15.

Estimated Number of Head Start Teaching Staff: 82; national average 2,257; rank: 15.

RAP OPERATIONS

Tasks identified as having major importance:

Provide services/materials to Head Start grantees
Conduct state training conferences
Conduct Advisory Committee
Facilitate collaborative agreements
Attend National RAP meetings
Implement management information system

Tasks identified as having minimal importance:

Participate on RAP task forces
Assist Head Start grantees with Annual Survey

Needs Assessments: 100 percent completed; national average 97 percent; greatest needs identified by Head Starts --- speech and language, behavior management, classroom management, screening, advocacy with public schools and local agencies.

Mainstreaming Training Conferences:

3 conferences were held, national average 11. 26 teaching staff were trained, representing 26 percent of the teachers and 26 percent of the teacher aides in RAP's service area, compared to 38 percent and 23 percent nationally. 12 others were in attendance. 38 total trainees; national average 1,027; rank: 15. 3 grantees attended, representing 100 percent of all grantees, compared to 87 percent nationally.

Short-Term Conference Evaluation:

Respondent Composition:

77 percent Head Start staff, 97 percent nationally
- 12 percent teachers, 42 percent, nationally
- 42 percent teacher aides, 23 percent nationally
- 24 percent others, 32 percent nationally

23 percent Non-Head Start staff, 2 percent nationally

Respondent Satisfaction:

Satisfaction 3.5 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average

- 62 percent enthusiastic, 55 percent nationally
- 31 percent satisfied, 41 percent nationally
- 8 percent some reservations, 3 percent nationally
- 0 percent dissatisfied, 0 percent nationally

Resource Providers:

750 providers catalogued in RAP file, national average 461.
30 providers used actively, national average 38.

Analysis of Activities and Task Records:

Activities:

220 recorded, 274 national average; range 132 to 532

Type	RAP %	National %
Training	1	4
TA	12	10
Information	51	25
Materials	36	61

Provider:

RAP 91 percent, nationally 95 percent.
Other 11 percent, nationally 5 percent.

Requestor:

Head Start 33 percent, nationally 75 percent.
Other 67 percent, nationally 25 percent.

The most frequently cited content attributes were: speech/language, administrative planning, child development theory, working with parents.

Geographic Distribution:

State	% of Activities
Alaska	92
Other	8

Task Records:

59 recorded, 73 national average. 22 task records were recorded on training; 357 were trained at 22 sessions, including 51 teachers, 49 teacher aides, 69 others, 179 non-Head Start, and 9 unidentified.

Advisory Committee:

2 meetings held. 17 members, 14 national average. Membership includes two of the required representatives (it does not include an ACYF/RO representative due to lack of travel funds at ACYF). However, all suggested representatives are included.

Task Force Membership:

Language Development
Child Abuse and Neglect
Innovative Approaches for Increasing Enrollment of Severely Handicapped Children in Head Start

Head Start Directors Meetings:

3 meetings were attended.

Management Information System:

Data entered in computer as of evaluation site visit:

Head Start grantees - all
Activities - some
Task Records - some
Providers - some
Resources - some

Head Start Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.4 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 11.0, national average 4.2. Problems cited by 0 percent of respondents, 6 percent national average. Mainstreaming training attended by 34 percent of teachers among the sampled grantees, 29 percent nationally; 100 percent of the sampled grantees attended, 86 percent nationally. 67 percent of the respondents identify training as the most valuable service RAP offers.

SEA Telephone Survey Results:

Satisfaction: 4.0 on a four point scale, 3.5 national average. Average number of types of contact with RAP: 3.0, national average 4.0. Frequency of contact: 4.0 on a four point scale national average 2.8.

Appendix B

SEA Impressions of the RAP Network:
Individual RAP Summaries

New England RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.0	2.8	1.8
Average no. types of contact	4.8	5.8	3.8
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.6	3.2

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

6/83 Indexes

States served	CT	ME *	MA	NH	RI	VT	NE RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+		M+	M+	I	O	3.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	M		M	M	R	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Types of contact							4.8	4.0
AC	x	NO		x		x		
Meetings, etc.	x		x	x	x	x		
Materials					x			
SEA/HS collab.		INTERVIEW						
LEA/HS collab.	x			x		x		
SEA as provider			x					
RAP as provider			x	x				
Info exchange	x		x	x	x	x		
Mutual project	x			x		x		
State plan								
SIG								
Other				x				
Intro contact								
None								

Most Valuable Service

Connecticut: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Rhode Island: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

* No Interview; position vacant.

Massachusetts: RAP serves as resource to the SEA.

New Hampshire: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start; Training; Materials; Collaboration.

Vermont: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

New York University RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.5	3.0	4.0
Average no. tyres of contact	4.5	5.5	5.5
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.0	3.3

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

6/83 Indexes

States served	NJ	NY	PR	VI	N.Y.U. RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	M+	I	O	2.5	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	M	R	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	N.O.	N.O.	4.0	3.5
Types of contact					4.5	4.0
AC	x	x				
Meetings, etc.	x	x	x	x		
Materials	x	x	x	x		
SEA/HS collab.	x	x				
LEA/HS collab.						
SEA as provider		x				
RAP as provider	x	x				
Info exchange	x	x		x		
Mutual project						
State plan						
SIG						
Other						
Intro contact						
None						

Most Valuable Service

New Jersey: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

New York: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Virgin Islands: SEA unable to respond because of recent initial contact.

Puerto Rico: Materials; Spanish-speaking consultants.

Suggestions

New Jersey: Conduct small, more localized workshops so as to get closer to the needs of handicap coordinators and special needs teachers.

Region III RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.8	3.0	3.0
Average no. types of contact	3.6	4.0	4.2
Satisfaction grade	3.3	3.8	3.6

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

							6/83 Indexes	
States served	DE	DC	MD*	PA	VA	WV	R III RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	M+		O	M	O	2.8	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	M		M	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	3.0	4.0		3.0	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.5
Types of contact							3.6	4.0
AC	x	x						
Meetings, etc.		x	NO INTERVIEW	x				
Materials				x		x		
SEA/HS collab.				x	x			
LEA/HS collab.								
SEA as provider					x			
RAP as provider								
Info exchange	x	x		x	x	x		
Mutual project		x			x			
State plan								
SIG								
Other	x	x						
Intro contact								
None								

Most Valuable Service

District of Columbia: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a resource to Head Start.

Delaware: Materials.

*No Interview; respondent on leave of absence.

Pennsylvania: Training; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Virginia: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

West Virginia: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Suggestions

Delaware: Assist Head Starts in planning for teachers to be released to attend RAP inservice training.

Pennsylvania: Summarize information on collaborative agreements in newsletter; develop a mechanism for including public school staff in RAP training.

Virginia: More follow-up with SEA.

Chapel Hill RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.8	2.7	3.3
Average no. types of contact	4.8	5.7	4.5
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	3.9

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

					6/83 Indexes	
States served	FL	GA	NC	SC	CH RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	O	M	O	2.8	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	M	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Types of contact					4.8	4.0
AC	x		x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x		x	x		
Materials	x			x		
SEA/HS collab.		x				
LEA/HS collab.	x		x			
SEA as provider						
RAP as provider	x		x			
Info exchange	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project						
State plan						
SIG	x					
Other	x					
Intro contact						
None						

Most Valuable Service

Florida: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start; Collaboration.

Georgia: Collaboration.

North Carolina: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start; Training; Information on other states.

South Carolina: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; Training; Materials.

Suggestions

Florida: More on-site consultation services to the SEA.

Nashville RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.7	.7	1.0
Average no. types of contact	4.3	1.0	1.0
Satisfaction grade	3.7	2.5	2.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/83 Indexes	
States served	AL	KY	TN	NASH RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M	O	M	2.7	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	R	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.7	3.5
Types of contact				4.3	4.0
AC			x		
Meetings, etc.	x		x		
Materials			x		
SEA/HS collab.	x				
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider	x		x		
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project			x		
State plan					
SIG					
Other	x		x		
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

Alabama: RAP's knowledge of state and regional resources.

Kentucky: Information on other states.

Tennessee: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a resource to Head Start.

Mississippi RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	3.0	2.0
Average no. types of contact	2.0	3.0	8.0
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.0	3.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interview

6/83 Indexes

State served	MS	MS RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	0	2.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	R		
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.5	3.5
Types of contact		2.0	4.0
AC			
Meetings, etc.	x		
Materials			
SEA/HS collab.	x		
LEA/HS collab.			
SEA as provider			
RAP as provider			
Info exchange			
Mutual project			
State plan			
SIG			
Other			
Intro contact			
None			

Most Valuable Service

Mississippi: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

The University of Illinois RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.7	2.3	3.0
Average no. types of contact	5.0	4.3	5.7
Satisfaction grade	3.7	3.3	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

	6/83 Indexes				
States served	IL	IN	OH	U OF I RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M	M+	3.7	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	R	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.5
Types of contact				5.0	4.0
AC	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x		x		
Materials		x			
SEA/HS collab.	x				
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider	x				
RAP as provider					
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project	x	x			
State plan					
SIG					
Other	x	x			
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

Indiana: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

Illinois: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start; Training.

Ohio: The RAP Advisory Committee serves as a forum for state people and Head Start to exchange ideas, information, etc.

Suggestion

Ohio: Provide the agenda for the AC meeting at least one month prior to the meeting date (travel for respondent must be approved by several people and the process is time consuming).

Portage RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.0	3.0	3.3
Average no. types of contact	4.5	3.3	3.7
Satisfaction grade	4.0	3.5	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	MI	MN*	WI	6/83 Indexes PORT RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	O		M+	3.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	M		M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0		4.0	4.0	3.5
Types of contact				4.5	4.0
AC	x	NO INTERVIEW	x		
Meetings, etc.	x		x		
Materials	x		x		
SEA/HS collab.	x				
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider			x		
Info exchange			x		
Mutual project					
State plan					
SIG					
OTHER					
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

Michigan: Training; Networking among the Handicap Coordinators.

Wisconsin: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

*No Interview; position vacant

Suggestion

Michigan: Invite more parents to RAP training; hold AC meetings at inexpensive locations.

Texas Tech RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	1.8	1.8
Average no. types of contact	4.3	2.0	2.6
Satisfaction grade	2.9	2.8	3.3

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

						6/83 Indexes	
States served	TX *	AR	LA	NM	OK	TT RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact		I	M+	O	I	2.0	2.8
Initiator of contact		R	M	R	M		
Satisfaction grade		N.O. 1.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.9	3.5
Types of contact						4.3	4.0
AC	NO		x				
Meetings, etc.		x	x				
Materials		x	x	x	x		
SEA/HS collab.			x				
LEA/HS collab.			x				
SEA as provider	INTERVIEW						
RAP as provider		x	x	x			
Info exchange		x	x	x	x		
Mutual project							
State plan							
SIG							
Other			x				
Intro contact							
None							

Most Valuable Service

Arkansas: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start.

New Mexico: Materials.

*No Interview; unable to reach after numerous attempts.

Oklahoma: Materials.

Louisiana: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; Training.

Suggestions

Arkansas: More contact.

New Mexico: Need 6-8 week lead time in writing to obtain permission to attend RAP functions out-of-state (even if plans are tentative).

Oklahoma: Increase communication to keep SEA abreast of issues.

Region VII RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.5	3.3	2.0
Average no. types of contact	4.8	6.0	4.0
Satisfaction grade	3.6	3.8	3.4

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

					6/83 Indexes	
States served	IA	KS	MO	NE	R. VII RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M	M	M	3.5	2.8
Initiator of contact	R	M	M	M		
Satisfaction grade	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.6	3.5
Types of contact					4.8	4.0
AC	x	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x	x	x		
Materials						
SEA/HS collab.		x				
LEA/HS collab.						
SEA as provider				x		
RAP as provider		x	x			
Info exchange	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project				x		
State plan						
SIG						
Other		x		x		
Intro contact						
None						

Most Valuable Service

Missouri: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start.

Kansas: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

Iowa: RAP serves as a resource to Head Start.

Nebraska: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Suggestions

Missouri: Instead of trying to respond to each individual Head Start's needs, systematically plan training of trainers with a theme; need for more cooperation between RAP and the T/TA provider for the state.

Kansas: Make the "New Friends" workshop available to public school staff.

University of Denver RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.5	2.3	2.5
Average no. types of contact	3.8	4.0	3.3
Satisfaction grade	3.7	3.4	3.8

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

							6/83 Indexes	
States served	CO	MT	ND	SD	UT	WY	U of D RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	0	0	0	M	0	2.5	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	R	R	M	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.5
Types of contact							3.8	4.0
AC	x		x	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x		x	x	x		
Materials	x							
SEA/HS collab.				x				
LEA/HS collab.	x							
SEA as provider								
RAP as provider								
Info exchange	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Mutual project	x							
State plan								
SIG	x							
Other	x			x				
Intro contact								
None								

Most Valuable Service

Colorado: Training.

North Dakota: RAP provides state agencies with a common ground; puts agencies in touch with one another around the state.

South Dakota: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; Training; AC is valuable -- lets others know what is happening around the rest of the region.

Montana: Training.

Utah: Training; Meeting with counterparts from other states.

Wyoming: Training.

Suggestions

Colorado: Do more joint training sessions and pooling of resources (with SEA) to improve quality and to improve communication between programs.

Utah: Reconvene Head Start/LEA/SEA group.

Los Angeles RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	3.3	1.7	3.0
Average no. types of contact	4.7	5.0	4.7
Satisfaction grade	3.7	3.5	3.5

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

				6/83 Indexes	
States served	AZ	CA	NV	LA RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	M	M	3.3	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.5
Types of contact				4.7	4.0
AC	x	x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x				
Materials	x		x		
SEA/HS collab.					
LEA/HS collab.					
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider	x	x	x		
Info exchange	x	x	x		
Mutual project					
State plan					
SIG					
Other	x	x			
Intro contact					
None					

Most Valuable Service

California: RAP serves as a liaison between SEA/LEA and Head Start.

Arizona: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; On-site and telephone TA.

Nevada: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; Training.

Pacific RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	3.5	3.0
Average no. types of contact	3.0	5.0	2.7
Satisfaction grade	2.5	3.3	2.8

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

6/83 Indexes

States served	HI	GU	NMI	PTT	AS	PACIFIC RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	M+	I	N	M	O	2.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	M	M	NA	R	M		
Satisfaction grade	3.5	3.0	N.O. 1.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.5
Types of contact						3.0	4.0
AC				x	x		
Meetings, etc.	x	x		x	x		
Materials							
SEA/HS collab.	x				x		
LEA/HS collab.							
SEA as provider							
RAP as provider							
Info exchange	x	x		x	x		
Mutual project	x						
State plan							
SIG							
Other	x				x		
Intro contact							
None			x				

Most Valuable Service

Hawaii: RAP serves as a liaison between the SEA and Head Start; Training.

Pacific Trust Territory: Training.

Guam: Training.

Northern Mariana Islands: SEA unable to respond because of lack of contact with RAP.

American Samoa: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP serves as a resource to Head Start; Translation services.

Suggestions

Hawaii: Formalize assistance to individual children during the transition process from Head Start to public school.

Pacific Trust Territory: Need for better coordination of training activities; inform SEA of RAP training prior to arrival on-site.

Northern Mariana Islands: Solicit input from DOE and use local resources; arrange with local college to offer credit for RAP training; know and address the unique local training needs of Head Start.

American Samoa: More contact; more on-site work and more coordination for on-site visits; consider an alternative time for summer workshop.

Problem

Northern Mariana Islands: Lack of contact and working relationship with DOE or local college; training is not developed based on local needs or unique circumstances of Head Start.

Portland State University RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	2.0	2.3	1.0
Average no. types of contact	3.0	3.0	2.0
Satisfaction grade	2.5	2.7	3.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interviews

States served	ID	OR	WN	6/83 Indexes PSU RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	N	M	M	2.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	NA	M	R		
Satisfaction grade	N.O. 1.0	4.0	N.O. 0	2.5	3.5
Types of contact				3.0	4.0
AC					
Meetings, etc.					
Materials		x			
SEA/HS collab.		x			
LEA/HS collab.		x			
SEA as provider					
RAP as provider					
Info exchange		x	x		
Mutual project		x	x		
State plan					
SIG			x		
Other					
Intro contact			x		
None	x				

Most Valuable Service

Washington: Collaboration.

Oregon: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA.

Idaho: SEA unable to respond because of lack of contact with RAP.

Suggestion

Idaho: RAP should take a leadership role in assessing future Head Start needs and common concerns with public schools throughout the RAP service area.

Alaska RAP

	6/83	6/82	6/81
Frequency index	4.0	4.0	3.0
Average no. types of contact	3.0	4.0	3.0
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	4.0

Abbreviated Contents of Interview

		6/83 Indexes	
State served	AK	AK RAP	NAT'L
Frequency of contact	"4	4.0	2.8
Initiator of contact	M		
Satisfaction grade	4.0	4.0	3.5
Types of contact		3.0	4.0
AC	x		
Meetings, etc.			
Materials			
SEA/HS collab.			
LEA/HS collab.			
SEA as provider			
RAP as provider			
Info exchange	x		
Mutual project			
State plan			
SIG			
Other	x		
Intro contact			
None			

Most Valuable Service

Alaska: RAP serves as a resource to the SEA; RAP's involvement with the rural infant program.